Resources for 2017 NAAB Visits

2016 Visiting Team, Mississippi State University

This binder is intended to provide individuals expected to serve on teams in 2017 with a set of resources for preparing for the visit.

Included are the following:

➢ *The NAAB 2014 Conditions for Substantial Equivalency* (approved July 18, 2014)

➢ *The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*, 2015 Edition (approved May 6, 2015)

➢ The slides used in your training session can be downloaded from www.naab.org.

The NAAB will produce new training materials in June and July 2017 in preparation for the 2018 visit cycle. You can stay up-to-date on the next edition of the *Team Member Handbook* at www.naab.org or you can follow us on Twitter (@NAABNews or @NAABExec).

For updates and the latest news, we encourage you to subscribe to and read the NAAB's "weekly whatever" news blast. Please send an email to forum@naab.org to be added to the distribution list.

If you have questions please feel free to contact the NAAB staff at 202.783.2007 or by email at forum@naab.org.

2014 Conditions for Accreditation

The National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

NAAB

Approved July 18, 2014

These conditions are in effect beginning April 1, 2015.

All programs, including candidates, scheduled for visits in 2016 must use the *2014 Conditions for Accreditation*.

2014 Conditions for Accreditation
National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

Contents

INTRODUCTION TO ACCREDITATION

Accreditation is a voluntary quality assurance process by which services and operations are evaluated by a third party against a set of standards established by the third party with input and collaboration from peers within the field. In the United States, accreditation of postsecondary institutions originated over a century ago. It is sought by colleges and universities and is conferred by nongovernmental bodies. Today, voluntary accreditation is distinguished by five components, which also guide the NAAB's policies and procedures:

- It is provided through private agencies.

- It requires a significant degree of self-evaluation by the institution or program, the results of which are summarized in a report to the agency.

- A team conducts a visit.

- Recommendations or judgments about accreditation are made by expert and trained peers.

- Institutions have the opportunity to respond to most steps in the process.[1]

The U.S. model for accreditation is based on the values of independent decision-making by institutions, the ability of institutions to develop and deliver postsecondary education within the context of their mission and history, the core tenets of academic freedom, and the respect for diversity of thought, pedagogy, and methodology. These principles and practices have remained relatively stable over the past 70 years.

HISTORY OF ACCREDITATION OF ARCHITECTURE EDUCATION

The first attempt to establish national standards in architecture education came with the founding of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA) in 1912 and its adoption two years later of "standard minima," which schools were required to meet to gain ACSA membership. While these standard minima were in place, ACSA membership was equivalent to accreditation.

In 1932 the ACSA abandoned the standard minima and, in 1940, joined with the American Institute of Architects (AIA) and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) to establish the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB)[2] with authority to accredit schools of architecture nationally. The 1940 founding agreement also announced the intention to create an integrated system of architecture education that would allow schools with varying resources and circumstances to develop according to their particular needs. The idea that the NAAB would "not . . . create conditions, nor . . . have conditions created, that will tend toward standardization of educational philosophies or practices" is considered the "prime directive" in the NAAB system today.

The foundation of the model for accreditation in architecture education that many know today was first outlined in a 1975 report, *The Restructuring of the NAAB*, issued jointly by the collaterals. Today, the NAAB's accreditation system for professional degree programs requires a self-assessment by the accredited degree program, an evaluation of that assessment by the NAAB, and a site visit by a NAAB team of trained volunteers that concludes with a recommendation to the NAAB of the term of accreditation. The decision regarding the term of accreditation is made by the NAAB directors.

---

[1]North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Higher Learning Commission, *The Handbook of Accreditation,* 3d ed. (2003).
[2]These four organizations, along with the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS), are referred to as the "collateral organizations," or "collaterals," within the architecture community.

Today, the NAAB has 13 members. Directors are volunteers nominated by the AIA, ACSA, NCARB, and the American Institute of Architecture Students (AIAS). In addition, two public directors serve on the board. Directors are not compensated but are reimbursed for their expenses.

On October 22, 2011, the NAAB directors approved a new statement of the NAAB's vision, mission, and values. Developed after several months of review and consideration, the document is a contemporary expression of the NAAB's founding principles. It guides the work of the NAAB in all its activities. The text of that statement follows.

> *From the 1940 Founding Agreement:*

> "The . . . societies creating this accrediting board, here record their intent not to create conditions, nor to have conditions created, that will tend toward standardization of educational philosophies or practices, but rather to create and maintain conditions that will encourage the development of practices suited to the conditions which are special to the individual school. The accrediting board must be guided by this intent."

Since 1975 the NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation* have emphasized self-assessment and student performance as central elements of the NAAB model. The directors have maintained their commitment to both of these as core tenets of the NAAB's criteria and procedures.

Mission: The NAAB develops and maintains a system of accreditation in professional architecture education that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs.

Vision: The NAAB aspires to be the leader in establishing educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architecture profession.

Values: The following principles serve as a guide and inspiration to the NAAB.

1. ***Shared Responsibility.*** The education of an architect is a responsibility shared by the academy and the profession in trust for the broader society and the public good.

2. ***Best Practices.*** The NAAB's accreditation processes are based on best practices in professional and specialized accreditation.

3. ***Program Accountability***. Architecture degree programs are accountable for the learning of their students. Thus, accreditation by the NAAB is based both on educational outcomes and institutional commitment to continuous improvement.

4. ***Preparing Graduates for Practice.*** A NAAB-accredited degree prepares students to live and work in a diverse world: to think critically; to make informed decisions; to communicate effectively; to engage in lifelong learning; and to exercise the unique knowledge and skills required to work and develop as professionals. Graduates are prepared for architectural internship, set on the path to examination and licensure, and prepared to engage in related fields.

5. ***Constant Conditions for Diverse Contexts***. The NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation* are broadly defined and achievement-oriented so that programs may meet these standards within the framework of their mission and vision, allowing for initiative and innovation. This imposes conditions on both the

NAAB and on architecture programs. The NAAB assumes the responsibility for undertaking a fair, thorough, and holistic evaluation process, relying essentially on the program's ability to demonstrate how, within its institutional context, it meets all evaluative criteria. The process relies on evaluation and judgment that, being rendered on the basis of qualitative factors, may defy precise substantiation.

6. ***Continuous Improvement through Regular Review.*** The NAAB *Conditions for Accreditation* are developed through an iterative process that acknowledges and values the contributions of educators, professionals in traditional and nontraditional practice, and students. The NAAB regularly convenes conversations on critical issues (e.g., studio culture) and challenges its collateral partners to acknowledge and respect the perspectives of the others.

While the NAAB stipulates the conditions and student performance criteria that must be met, it specifies neither the educational format nor the form of student work that may serve as evidence of having met these criteria. Programs are encouraged to develop unique learning and teaching strategies as well as methods and materials to satisfy these criteria.

The NAAB encourages innovative methods for satisfying the criteria, provided the program has a formal evaluation process for assessing student achievement and documenting the results.

Specific areas and levels of excellence will vary among accredited degree programs as will approaches to meeting the conditions and reporting requirements. The positive aspects of a degree program in one area cannot override deficiencies in another.

NAAB ACCREDITATION DOCUMENTS

Five documents are referenced with accreditation.

1. NAAB *2014 Conditions for Accreditation*

2. NAAB *Procedures for Accreditation*

3. *NAAB Guide to the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and Preparation of Architecture Program Reports*

4. Architecture Program Reports (APRs)

5. Visiting Team Reports (VTRs)

The *2014 Conditions for Accreditation* define the standards that professional degree programs in architecture are expected to meet in order to ensure that students are prepared to move to the next steps in their careers, including internship and licensure. This document was last revised in 2009; it will be revised again in 2019.

Beginning April 1, 2015, the *2014 Conditions for Accreditation* apply to all programs seeking continued accreditation, candidacy, continuation of candidacy, or initial accreditation.

The NAAB *Procedures for Accreditation* outline the procedures that programs and visiting teams must follow in order to ensure a uniform accrediting process. This document was last revised in 2012; it will be revised again in 2015 and subsequently at two-year intervals.

The *NAAB Guide to the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and Preparation of Architecture Program Reports* is a new document under development by the NAAB. The first iteration includes an introduction to and commentary on the preparation of the first draft of the *2014*

Conditions. It will later be revised to include instructions for preparing Architecture Program Reports. In subsequent years, beginning in 2016, it will be revised annually based on surveys and evaluations of the visit process. This document is advisory and nonbinding on the NAAB.

An APR is a self-analytical, narrative report prepared by the program before a visit. Instructions and required templates for these reports will be provided by the NAAB in the *Guide* described above.

A VTR is prepared by a NAAB visiting team at the conclusion of each visit. In these reports the visiting team affirms that materials have been presented or reviewed in accordance with the *2014 Conditions* and the *Procedures.* Instructions and templates for preparing VTRs are found in the *Procedures.*

PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

This part addresses the commitment of the institution, its faculty, staff, and students to the development and evolution of the program over time.

- **IDENTITY AND SELF-ASSESSMENT**: The program must be defined and sustained through a robust network of policies, documents, and activities related to history, mission, culture, self-assessment, and future planning.

- **RESOURCES**: The program must have the human, physical, financial, and information resources necessary to support student learning in a professional degree program in architecture.

Programs demonstrate their compliance with Part One in two ways:

- A narrative report that briefly responds to each request to "demonstrate, describe, or document."

- A review of evidence, artifacts, and observations by the visiting team, as well as through interviews conducted during the visit.

For instructions on how to present this material in the APR and during the visit, see the NAAB *Procedures for Accreditation* and the *NAAB Guide to the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and Preparation of Architecture Program Reports.*

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 shape the program's pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.

- The program must describe its active role and relationship within its academic context and university community. The description must include the program's benefits to the institutional setting and how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. The description must also include how the program as a unit develops multidisciplinary relationships and leverages opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the community.

I.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages 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 nontraditional.

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy[3] and a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition, the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.

- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include but are not limited to field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.

I.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources.

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students during the next two accreditation cycles as compared with the existing diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution.

- The program must document that institutional, college, or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college, or institutional level.

---

[3] For additional information on the development and assessment of studio culture, see *Toward an Evolution of Studio Culture*, American Institute of Architecture Students, 2008; "The Redesign of Studio Culture: A Report of the AIAS Studio Culture Task Force," AIAS, 2002; and "Studio Culture Summit Report," AIAS, 2004.

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that affect the education and development of professional architects. The response to each perspective must further identify how these perspectives will continue to be addressed as part of the program's long-range planning activities.

- A. **Collaboration and Leadership**. The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences and opportunities for leadership roles.

- B. **Design**. The program must describe its approach to developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multidimensional process involving problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value.

- C. **Professional Opportunity**. The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunities and career paths, including the transition to internship and licensure.

- D. **Stewardship of the Environment**. The program must describe its approach to developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environment and natural resources.

- E. **Community and Social Responsibility**. The program must describe its approach to developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens able to understand what it means to be professional members of society and to act ethically on that understanding.

I.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has a planning process for continuous improvement that identifies multiyear objectives within the context of the institutional and program mission and culture

I.1.6 Assessment

- A. **Program Self-Assessment:** The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

  - How well the program is progressing toward its mission and stated objectives.

  - Progress against its defined multiyear objectives.

  - Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.

  - Strengths, challenges, and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

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

- B. **Curricular Assessment and Development**: The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments and must identify the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives, including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2—RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources and Human Resource Development*:* The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate human resources to support student learning and achievement. Human resources include full- and part-time instructional faculty, administrative leadership, and technical, administrative, and other support staff.

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement.

- The program must demonstrate that an Architectural Licensing Advisor (formerly known as an Intern Development Program [IDP] Educator Coordinator) has been appointed, is trained in the issues of IDP, has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined by NCARB, and regularly attends ALA training and development programs.

- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.

- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

I.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the physical resources available and how they support the pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Physical resources include but are not limited to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.

- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning, including labs, shops, and equipment.

- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities, including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

- Information resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

If the program's pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, on-site, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.[4]

I.2.3 Financial Resources: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

I.2.4 Information Resources: The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information, as well as appropriate visual and digital resources that support professional education in architecture.

Further, the program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have access to architecture librarians and visual resource professionals who provide information services

---

[4] In reviewing a program's physical resources, the NAAB is not offering an opinion as to whether, or certifying that, the institution's facilities comply with all applicable fire, safety, building, and health codes and regulations.

that teach and develop the research, evaluative, and critical thinking skills necessary for professional practice and lifelong learning.

I.2.5 Administrative Structure and Governance

- **Administrative Structure**: The program must describe its administrative structure and identify key personnel within the context of the program and school, college, and institution.

- **Governance**: The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

This part has four sections that address the following:

- **STUDENT PERFORMANCE**. This section includes the Student Performance Criteria (SPC). Programs must demonstrate that graduates are learning at the level of achievement defined for each of the SPC listed in this part. Compliance will be evaluated through the review of student work.

- **CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK**. This section addresses the program and institution relative to regional accreditation, degree nomenclature, credit hour requirements, general education, and access to optional studies.

- **EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION**. The NAAB recognizes that students entering an accredited program from a preprofessional program and those entering an accredited program from a non-preprofessional degree program have different needs, aptitudes, and knowledge bases. In this section, programs are required to demonstrate the process by which incoming students are evaluated and to document that the SPC expected to have been met in educational experiences in nonaccredited programs have indeed been met.

- **PUBLIC INFORMATION**. The NAAB expects accredited degree programs to provide information to the public about accreditation activities and the relationship between the program and the NAAB, admissions and advising, and career information, as well as accurate public information about accredited and nonaccredited architecture programs.

Programs demonstrate their compliance with Part Two in four ways:

- A narrative report that briefly responds to each request to "describe, document, or demonstrate."

- A review of evidence, artifacts, and observations by the visiting team, as well as through interviews conducted during the visit.

- A review of student work that demonstrates student achievement of the SPC at the required level of learning.

- A review of web sites, URLs, and other electronic materials.

For instructions on how to present this material in the APR and during the visit, see the NAAB *Procedures for Accreditation* and the *NAAB Guide to the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation and Preparation of Architecture Program Reports.*

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1—STUDENT PERFORMANCE—EDUCATIONAL REALMS AND STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that each graduate possesses the knowledge and skills defined by the criteria below. The knowledge and skills defined here represent those required to prepare graduates for the path to internship, examination, and licensure and to engage in related fields. The program must provide student work as evidence that its graduates have satisfied each criterion.

The criteria encompass two levels of accomplishment:[5]

- *Understanding*—The capacity to classify, compare, summarize, explain, and/or interpret information.

- *Ability*—Proficiency in using specific information to accomplish a task, correctly selecting the appropriate information, and accurately applying it to the solution of a specific problem, while also distinguishing the effects of its implementation.

II.1.1 Student Performance Criteria (SPC): The NAAB establishes SPC to help accredited degree programs prepare students for the profession while encouraging education practices suited to the individual degree program. The SPC are organized into realms to more easily understand the relationships between each criterion.

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation. Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the study and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental contexts. Graduates must also be able to use a diverse range of skills to think about and convey architectural ideas, including writing, investigating, speaking, drawing, and modeling.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include

- Being broadly educated.

- Valuing lifelong inquisitiveness.

- Communicating graphically in a range of media.

- Assessing evidence.

- Comprehending people, place, and context.

- Recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society.

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that each graduate possesses the following:

A.1   Professional Communication Skills: *Ability* to write and speak effectively and use representational media appropriate for both within the profession and with the general public.

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.

---

[5] See also L.W. Anderson and D.R. Krathwold, eds., *Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* (New York: Longman, 2001).

A.3 Investigative Skills: *Ability* to gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.

A.4 Architectural Design Skills: *Ability* to effectively use basic formal, organizational and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

A.5 Ordering Systems: *Ability* to apply the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

A.6 Use of Precedents: *Ability* to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices about the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

A.7 History and Global Culture: *Understanding* of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, and regional settings in terms of their political, economic, social, ecological, and technological factors.

A.8 Cultural Diversity and Social Equity*: Understanding* of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to sites, buildings, and structures.

Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills, and Knowledge. Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems, and materials and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. In addition, the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.

- Comprehending constructability.

- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.

- Conveying technical information accurately

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that each graduate possesses skills in the following areas

B.1 Pre-Design: *Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project that includes an assessment of client and user needs; an inventory of spaces and their requirements; an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings); a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and an assessment of their implications for the project; and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

B.2 Site Design: *Ability* to respond to site characteristics, including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, ecology, climate, and building orientation, in the development of a project design.

B.3.   Codes and Regulations: *Ability* to design sites, facilities, and systems that are responsive to relevant codes and regulations, and include the principles of life-safety and accessibility standards.

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

B.5   Structural Systems: *Ability* to demonstrate the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravitational, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system.

B.6   Environmental Systems: *Ability* to demonstrate the principles of environmental systems' design, how design criteria can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This demonstration must include active and passive heating and cooling, solar geometry, daylighting, natural ventilation, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

B.7   Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies: *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

B.8   Building Materials and Assemblies: *Understanding* of the basic principles used in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components, and assemblies based on their inherent performance, including environmental impact and reuse.

B.9   Building Service Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems, including lighting, mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation, security, and fire protection systems.

B.10   Financial Considerations: *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions. Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to demonstrate that they have the ability to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include

- Comprehending the importance of research pursuits to inform the design process.

- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.

- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.

- Responding to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that each graduate possesses skills in the following areas:

C.1   Research: *Understanding* of the theoretical and applied research methodologies and practices used during the design process.

C.2   Integrated Evaluations and Decision-Making Design Process: *Ability* to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This demonstration includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

C.3   Integrative Design: *Ability* to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

Realm D: Professional Practice. Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and the need to act legally, ethically, and critically for the good of the client, society, and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include

- Comprehending the business of architecture and construction.

- Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.

- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that each graduate possesses skills in the following areas:

D.1   Stakeholder Roles in Architecture: *Understanding* of the relationships among key stakeholders in the design process—client, contractor, architect, user groups, local community—and the architect's role to reconcile stakeholder needs.

D.2   Project Management: *Understanding* of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams; identifying work plans, project schedules, and time requirements; and recommending project delivery methods.

D.3   Business Practices: *Understanding* of the basic principles of a firm's business practices, including financial management and business planning, marketing, organization, and entrepreneurship.

D.4   Legal Responsibilities: *Understanding* of the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.

D.5   Professional Conduct: *Understanding* of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice and understanding the role of the NCARB Rules of Conduct and the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2—CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation

For a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. 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); or the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC).

2. Institutions located outside the United States and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency may pursue candidacy and accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture under the following circumstances:

   a. The institution has explicit, written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program's country or region.

   b. At least one of the agencies granting permission has a system of institutional quality assurance and review which the institution is subject to and which includes periodic evaluation.

   Institutions in this category that are interested in seeking candidacy for NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs with the following titles: 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 optional studies.

The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs. The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are recognized by the public as accredited degrees and therefore should not be used by nonaccredited programs.

Therefore, any institution that uses the degree title B. Arch., M. Arch., or D. Arch. for a nonaccredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these nonaccredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified below. All accredited programs must conform to the following minimum credit hour requirements:

Bachelor of Architecture. Accredited degree programs awarding the B. Arch. degree must require a minimum of 150 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent,[6] in academic course work in general studies, professional studies, and optional studies, all of

---

[6] Programs that operate on the quarter system must multiply these totals by 1.5 to identify the approximate minimum credit requirements for their programs.

which are delivered or accounted for (either by transfer or articulation) by the institution that will grant the degree.

- **Master of Architecture**. Accredited degree programs awarding the M. Arch. degree may take three forms:

    o Single Institution (SI): Candidates for this degree have completed at least 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of which at least 30 credit hours are taken at the graduate level and all of which are delivered or accounted for (either by transfer or articulation) by the institution that will grant the degree. The program is a combination of undergraduate and graduate education. Combined undergraduate and graduate degree programs structured in this manner must include general studies, professional studies, and optional studies.

    o Preprofessional-plus: Candidates for this degree have completed at least 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of which at least 30 credit hours are taken at the graduate level, and hold a preprofessional degree[7] in architecture or a related field before admission to the graduate degree program. The graduate-level academic course work must include professional studies and optional studies.

    o Non-preprofessional degree-plus: Candidates for this degree have completed at least 168 semester credit hours, or the quarter-hour equivalent, of which at least 30 credit hours are taken at the graduate level, and hold an undergraduate degree from a regionally accredited institution before admission to the graduate degree program. The graduate-level academic course work must include professional studies and optional studies.

- **Doctor of Architecture**. Accredited degree programs awarding the D. Arch. degree must require an undergraduate baccalaureate degree (minimum of 120 undergraduate semester credit hours, or the undergraduate-level quarter-hour equivalent) for admission. Further, the D. Arch. must require a minimum of 90 graduate-level semester credit hours, or the graduate-level quarter-hour equivalent, in academic course work in professional studies and optional studies.

General studies, professional studies, and optional studies are defined as follows:

General Studies. Courses offered in the following subjects: communications, history, humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, foreign languages, and mathematics, either as an admission requirement or as part of the curriculum. These courses must be offered outside the academic unit that offers the NAAB-accredited degree and have no architectural content. Architecture courses cannot be used to meet the NAAB general studies requirement. In many cases, this

---

[7] Preprofessional architecture degree: The term refers to architecturally focused four-year undergraduate degrees that are not accredited by the NAAB. These degrees have such titles as B.S. in Architecture, B.S. in Architectural Studies, B.A. in Architecture, Bachelor of Environmental Design, Bachelor of Architectural Studies, etc. The amount of architecturally defined content in these programs may vary from institution to institution and will determine the length of time required to complete the subsequent NAAB-accredited program.

requirement can be satisfied by the general education program of an institution's baccalaureate degree**.**

Professional Studies. Courses with architectural content required of all students in the NAAB-accredited program. These courses are considered the core of a professional degree program. Student work from these courses is expected to satisfy the NAAB SPC (Condition II.1). The degree program has the flexibility to require additional professional studies courses to address its mission or institutional context. Further, the program may choose to provide cocurricular or extracurricular learning opportunities to supplement or complement required course work.

Optional Studies (Curricular Flexibility). All professional degree programs must provide sufficient flexibility in the curriculum to allow students to pursue their special interests either by taking additional courses offered in other academic units or departments, or by taking courses offered within the department offering the accredited program but outside the professional studies curriculum.

Table 1. Minimum Credit Distribution for NAAB-Accredited Degrees

NOTE: This table lists semester-credit minimum requirements. Programs that operate on the quarter system must multiply these totals by 1.5 to identify the minimum credit requirements for their programs.

	B. Arch.	M. Arch. (SI)	M. Arch. (preprofessional plus)	M. Arch. (non-preprofessional plus)	D. Arch.
General Studies	45 credits	45 credits	Defined by baccalaureate required for admission	Defined by baccalaureate required for admission	Defined by baccalaureate required for admission
Optional Studies	10	10	10	10	10
Professional Studies	As defined by the program	As defined by the program	As defined by the program	As defined by the program	As defined by the program
Undergraduate Credits	150	As defined by the program	As defined by the program	As defined by the program	120
Graduate Credits	0	30	30	30	90
Total Credits	150	168	168	168	210

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3—EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process for evaluating the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic course work related to satisfying NAAB student performance criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.

- In the event a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted 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.

- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate-degree or associate-degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of a professional degree program can be understood by a candidate before accepting the offer of admission. See also Condition II.4.6.

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4—PUBLIC INFORMATION

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available online.

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the *exact language* found in the NAAB *2014 Conditions for Accreditation*, Appendix 1, in catalogs and promotional media.

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty, and the public:

> The *2014 Conditions for Accreditation*

> The *Conditions for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004, depending on the date of the last visit)

> The *Procedures for Accreditation* (edition currently in effect)

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that help them develop, evaluate, and implement career, education, and employment plans.

II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs

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

> All Interim Progress Reports (and Annual Reports [narrative only] submitted 2009–2012)

> All NAAB responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to Annual Reports [narrative] submitted 2009–2012)

> The most recent decision letter from the NAAB

> The most recent APR[8]

> The final edition of the most recent Visiting Team Report, including attachments and addenda

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/postsecondary education in architecture. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their web sites to the results.

II.4.6. Admissions and Advising

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how

---

[8] This is understood to be the APR from the previous visit, not the APR for the visit currently in process.

applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and from outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions

- Admissions requirements, admissions decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation and advanced standing

- Forms and a description of the process for the evaluation of preprofessional degree content

- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships

- Student diversity initiatives

II.4.7 Student Financial Information

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

PART THREE (III): ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program must submit annual statistical reports in the format required by the NAAB *Procedures.*

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.

III.2 Interim Progress Reports. The program must submit Interim Progress Reports to the NAAB (See, NAAB *Procedures for Accreditation*)*.*

Appendix 1: Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degress — Required Text for Catalogs and Promotional Materials

The following statement must be included, in its entirety, in the catalogs and promotional materials of all accredited programs and candidate programs.

> "In the United States, most registration boards require a degree from an accredited professional degree program as a prerequisite for licensure. The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), which is the sole agency authorized to accredit professional degree programs in architecture offered by institutions with U.S. regional accreditation, recognizes three types of degrees: the Bachelor of Architecture, the Master of Architecture, and the Doctor of Architecture. A program may be granted an eight-year, three-year, or two-year term of accreditation, depending on the extent of its conformance with established educational standards.
>
> Doctor of Architecture and Master of Architecture degree programs may require a preprofessional undergraduate degree in architecture for admission. However, the preprofessional degree is not, by itself, recognized as an accredited degree."

This text is to be followed by the following information about each NAAB-accredited program:

[name of university, name of academic unit] offers the following NAAB-accredited degree program(s) (If an institution offers more than one track for an M. Arch. or D. Arch. based on the type of undergraduate/preparatory education required, please list all tracks separately):

  [name of degree] (prerequisite + total number of credits required)

In addition, the program is required to publish the year of the next accreditation visit for each accredited program. A sample follows:

SAMPLE TEXT FOR ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

In the United States, most registration boards require a degree from an accredited professional degree program as a prerequisite for licensure. The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), which is the sole agency authorized to accredit professional degree programs in architecture offered by institutions with U.S. regional accreditation, recognizes three types of degrees: the Bachelor of Architecture, the Master of Architecture, and the Doctor of Architecture. A program may be granted an eight-year, three-year, or two-year term of accreditation, depending on the extent of its conformance with established educational standards.

Doctor of Architecture and Master of Architecture degree programs may require a preprofessional undergraduate degree in architecture for admission. However, the preprofessional degree is not, by itself, recognized as an accredited degree.

[name of university, name of academic unit (department, college, or school)], offers the following NAAB-accredited degree programs:

B. Arch. (150 undergraduate credits)

M. Arch. (preprofessional degree + 42 graduate credits)

M. Arch. (non-preprofessional degree + 63 credits)

Next accreditation visit for all programs: 2017

In addition to the above text, programs that have been granted candidacy status must also include the following in its entirety:

"The NAAB grants candidacy status to new programs that have developed viable plans for achieving initial accreditation. Candidacy status indicates that a program expects to achieve initial accreditation within six years of achieving candidacy, if its plan is properly implemented. In order to meet the education requirement set forth by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, an applicant for an NCARB Certificate must hold a professional degree in architecture from a program accredited by the NAAB; the degree must have been awarded not more than two years prior to initial accreditation. However, meeting the education requirement for the NCARB Certificate may not be equivalent to meeting the education requirement for registration in a specific jurisdiction. Please contact NCARB for more information."

This text is to be followed by the following information about each candidate program:

[name of university, name of academic unit] was granted candidacy status for the following professional degree program(s) in architecture:

[name of degree] [prerequisite + total number of credits required]

 [year candidacy was awarded]

[year and purpose of the next visit]

[projected year of initial accreditation]

A sample follows:

SAMPLE TEXT FOR CANDIDATE PROGRAMS

In the United States, most registration boards require a degree from an accredited professional degree program as a prerequisite for licensure. The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), which is the sole agency authorized to accredit professional degree programs in architecture offered by institutions with U.S. regional accreditation, recognizes three types of degrees: the Bachelor of Architecture, the Master of Architecture, and the Doctor of Architecture. A program may be granted an eight-year, three-year, or two-year term of accreditation, depending on the extent of its conformance with established educational standards.

Doctor of Architecture and Master of Architecture degree programs may require a preprofessional undergraduate degree in architecture for admission. However, the preprofessional degree is not, by itself, recognized as an accredited degree.

The NAAB grants candidacy status to new programs that have developed viable plans for achieving initial accreditation. Candidacy status indicates that a program expects to achieve initial accreditation within six years of achieving candidacy, if its plan is properly implemented.

In order to meet the education requirement set forth by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, an applicant for an NCARB Certificate must hold a professional degree in architecture from a program accredited by the NAAB; the degree must have been awarded not more than two years prior to initial accreditation. However, meeting the education requirement for the NCARB Certificate may not be equivalent to meeting the education requirement for registration in a specific jurisdiction. Please contact NCARB for more information.

[name of university, name of academic unit (department, college, or school)], is in candidacy for accreditation of the following NAAB-accredited degree program:

   M. Arch. (preprofessional degree + 45 graduate credits)

   Initial Candidacy granted: 2014

   Next visit for continuation of candidacy: 2016

   Projected year of initial accreditation: 2020

Appendix 2. Glossary

Ability	Proficiency in using specific information to accomplish a task, correctly selecting the appropriate information, and accurately applying it to the solution of a specific problem, while also distinguishing the effects of its implementation
Access	The program must show that students, faculty, or staff have the ability to obtain or make use of a service, specialized professional, or document.
ACSA	Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture
AIAS	American Institute of Architecture Students
APR	Architecture Program Report
APR-IC	Architecture Program Report for Initial Candidacy
APR-IA	Architecture Program Report for Initial Accreditation
ARE	Architect Registration Examination
Demonstrate	The program must illustrate and explain, especially with many examples
Describe	The program must give a written account of an activity or a set of processes
Document	The program must convey evidence or proof through writing and then provide supporting materials or documentation of activity or policies
IDP	Intern Development Program
Must	Sets a minimum requirement; establishes what is mandatory
NAAB	National Architectural Accrediting Board
NCARB	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards

Shall	Sets a minimum requirement; establishes what is mandatory (i.e., same as must).
Understanding	The capacity to classify, compare, summarize, explain, and/or interpret information.
VTR	Visiting Team Report
VTR-IC	Visiting Team Report for Initial Candidacy
VTR-IA	Visiting Team Report for Initial Accreditation

NAAB

PROCEDURES FOR ACCREDITATION

Professional Degree Programs in Architecture 2015 Edition

Approved May 6, 2015

This edition is in effect for all visits scheduled to take place after January 1, 2016.

Table of Contents

SECTION 1. OVERVIEW

About the National Architectural Accrediting Board

The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) is both a decision-making and policy-generating body composed of a 13-member Board of Directors.

The NAAB is an independent, nonprofit corporation with an office in Washington, DC. The corporation is designated as tax-exempt under USC 26 § 501(c)(3).

The NAAB reserves the right to vary from these published *Procedures* if to do so is in the best interests of a program or programs, or the accreditation process. The Board of Directors has delegated responsibility for establishing and maintaining the operating procedures that support accreditation activities, including the implementation of these *Procedures,* to the executive director.

Vision, Mission, and Values

From the 1940 Founding Agreement:

> "The … societies creating this accrediting board, here record their intent not to create conditions, nor to have conditions created, that will tend toward standardization of educational philosophies or practices, but rather to create and maintain conditions that will encourage the development of practices suited to the conditions which are special to the individual school. The accrediting board must be guided by this intent."

Since 1975, the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* have emphasized self-assessment and student performance as central elements of the NAAB model. The directors have maintained their commitment to both of these elements as core tenets of the NAAB's criteria and procedures.

Vision: The NAAB aspires to be the leader in establishing educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architectural profession.

Mission: The NAAB develops and maintains a system of accreditation in professional architectural education that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs.

Values: The following principles serve as a guide and inspiration to the NAAB:

1.   *Shared Responsibility.* The education of an architect is a responsibility shared by the academy and the profession in trust for the broader society and the public good.

2.   *Best Practices.* The NAAB's accreditation processes are based on best practices in professional and specialized accreditation.

3.   *Program Accountability.* Architecture degree programs are accountable for the learning of their students. Thus, accreditation by the NAAB is based both on educational outcomes and institutional commitment to continuous improvement.

4.   *Preparing Graduates for Practice.* A NAAB-accredited degree prepares students to live and work in a diverse world: to think critically; to make informed decisions; to

communicate effectively; to engage in life-long learning; and to exercise the unique knowledge and skills required to work and develop as professionals. Graduates are prepared for architectural internship, set on the pathway to examination and licensure, and prepared to engage in related fields.

5. ***Constant Conditions for Diverse Contexts.*** The *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* are broadly defined and achievement-oriented so that programs may meet these standards within the framework of their mission and vision, allowing for initiative and innovation. This imposes conditions on both the NAAB and on architectural programs. The NAAB assumes the responsibility for undertaking a fair, thorough, and holistic evaluation process, relying essentially on the program's ability to demonstrate how, within its institutional context, it meets all evaluative criteria. The process relies on evaluation and judgment that, being rendered on the basis of qualitative factors, may defy precise substantiation.

6. ***Continuous Improvement through Regular Review.*** The *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* are developed through an iterative process that acknowledges and values the contributions of educators, professionals in traditional and non-traditional practice, and students. The NAAB regularly convenes conversations on critical issues (e.g., studio culture) and challenges the other four collateral partners to acknowledge and respect the perspectives of the others.

The NAAB was founded in 1940 to "produce and maintain current a list of accredited schools of architecture in the United States and its possessions, with the general objective that a well-integrated and coordinated program of architectural education be developed that is national in scope and afford opportunity for architectural schools with varying resources and operating conditions to find places appropriate to their objectives and do high class work therein." Since 1975, the NAAB has accredited professional degree programs rather than schools or universities and only accredits the first professional degree program offered by any school or university. As such, the NAAB does not accredit preprofessional degrees or other preparatory education that may serve as a prerequisite for admission to a professional degree program.

The NAAB is the only agency recognized by registration boards in U.S. jurisdictions to accredit professional degree programs in architecture. Because most registration boards require an applicant for licensure to hold a NAAB-accredited degree, obtaining such a degree is an essential part of gaining access to the licensed practice of architecture.

The curriculum of a NAAB-accredited degree program includes general studies, professional studies, and optional studies. To gain and retain accreditation of its degree program, each institution must both develop a program specific to its mission and educate students to be knowledgeable and capable of producing work that can be measured by, and satisfy, NAAB Student Performance Criteria (SPC).

The NAAB fully recognizes the rights and responsibilities of the educational institutions that offer degrees in preparation for entry into professional careers in the licensed practice of architecture as defined and governed by the laws of the individual states and jurisdictions.

Educational institutions are composed of a faculty responsible for the appropriate development of individual courses and curricula that are required, at a minimum, to provide each student with the educational opportunity to meet the Student Performance Criteria as defined by the NAAB.

The NAAB recognizes the institutional rights and responsibilities of the faculty to explore fundamental and innovative educational concepts, scholarship, research, methods, and technologies that exceed the minimum Student Performance Criteria and that will lead to even higher standards of performance within the profession of architecture and related alternative careers of diverse and creative service to society.

Accreditation Documents

The *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* and the *2015 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation* outline, respectively, the requirements that an accredited degree program must meet and the procedures that it and the visiting teams must follow in order to demonstrate the achievement of minimum standards and a uniform accrediting process. These documents govern accreditation actions for the period 2016-2020 (including *Architecture Program Reports* (APRs) submitted in September 2015).

The *Procedures* document is a companion to the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*. Each should be read in the context of the other.

The *Procedures* are reviewed and updated, as needed, at least every two years to reflect changes in operating policy or procedures that may have been undertaken since the last full accreditation process review. Proposed changes are released for public comment and review at least 120 days prior to the Board meeting at which they are scheduled to be approved.

In addition to accreditation documents, the NAAB publishes other materials that provide advice and best practices to programs and teams preparing for accreditation visits. These are made available on the NAAB website.

Conditions for Accreditation

The *2014 Conditions for Accreditation,* published separately, are the criteria that professional degree programs in architecture are expected to meet in order to achieve and maintain accreditation by the NAAB. The *Conditions* are reviewed every five years through a comprehensive process of assessment, research, analysis, review by the Board of Directors, and consultation with representatives of the other collateral organizations—this is known as the Accreditation Review Conference.

The resulting revisions are reviewed by the collateral organizations and approved by the NAAB Board of Directors in the year following the accreditation review process. The next edition of the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* is scheduled for release in 2019.

SECTION 2. GENERAL INFORMATION

This section covers general information that applies to NAAB processes, particularly visits and visiting teams.

1. **Definitions**

Term	Definition/Description	Section/Related Documents
Architecture Program Report	The APR is a narrative document that is comprehensive and self-analytical. It is expected to succinctly describe how a program meets each of the conditions for accreditation.	Sections 4 and 5 *Guide for Preparing an Architecture Program Report*
Accreditation, Continuing	Unless specifically noted in the Board's decision, all terms of accreditation are effective on January 1 of the year in which the visit took place. Conversely, all terms of accreditation expire on January 1 of the year in which a visit is scheduled to take place unless and until the NAAB approves a motion for a term of accreditation. Programs that have completed the first term of continuing accreditation following a term of initial accreditation may seek subsequent terms of continuing accreditation.	Sections 3 and 5
Accreditation, Initial	Initial accreditation is probationary in nature and indicates that, although deficiencies may be present, the institution has established plans and is making sufficient progress to address or remove the deficiencies by the time of the first visit for continuing accreditation under Section 3.3.	Section 4
Candidacy, Initial	Initial candidacy indicates that the program and institution are prepared to implement a Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation within six years.	Section 4
Candidacy, Continuing	Continuation of candidacy indicates that a program is progressing with the implementation of a Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation.	Section 4

Candidacy, Eligibility	Eligibility for candidacy indicates that an institution's Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation is reasonable and achievable.	Section 4
Candidacy, Maximum Term	The maximum period of candidacy is six years. Should a program fail to achieve initial accreditation within the maximum period, it must submit a new candidacy application.	Section 4
Visiting Team	Individuals, nominated by the NAAB and approved by the program, who conduct a visit to review/evaluate a professional degree program in architecture.	Sections 4 and 5
Visiting Team Member	One of the individuals nominated to serve on a visiting team. This individual may be an educator, practitioner, NCARB member board member, or a student.	Sections 4 and 5
Visiting Team Chair	The individual nominated by the NAAB and approved by the executive committee to lead the visiting team. The individual responsible for completing the *Visiting Team Report*.	Sections 4 and 5
Non-Voting Team Member	An individual nominated by the program, in addition to the team assigned by the NAAB, whose role is to add useful perspective to the accreditation process.	Section 5
Visiting Team Report	The VTR conveys the visiting team's assessment of whether the program meets the *Conditions for Accreditation* as measured by evidence of student learning, the overall capacity of the program to fulfill its obligations to ensure student achievement, and the overall learning environment. It reports the degree to which the program is functioning in the manner described in the APR.	Section 2, 4, and 5
Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation	An analysis of the current status of the program that identifies long-term objectives for establishing and implementing a new NAAB-accredited degree program.	Section 4

Professional Degrees and Curriculum Changes	These are changes to the program that require review by the NAAB. Generally, these are major curricular changes that may or may not require a change of title.	Section 6
Nomenclature Changes	These are changes to the program that require review by the NAAB. Generally, they are limited to modest curricular changes needed to ensure that the newly-titled program meets the NAAB's minimum credit-hour requirements for each degree.	Section 6
Annual Statistical Report	This report captures statistical information on the institution in which an architecture program is located and on the accredited degree program. For the purposes of the report, the definitions are taken from the glossary of terms used by the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Much of the information requested in this report corresponds to the *Institutional Characteristics, Completion and 12-Month Enrollment Report* submitted to IPEDS in the fall by the institution. Data submitted for this report is for the previous fiscal year (July 1-June 30).	Section 9 (see also *2014 Conditions for Accreditation*, Part III)
Interim Progress Report, Year Two	This is a narrative report, accompanied by evidence, which is submitted two years after a program receives either a four-year or an eight-year term of continuing accreditation. The report must address all deficiencies cited in the previous VTR, as well as other items.	Section 10
Interim Progress Report, Year Five	This is a narrative report, accompanied by evidence, which is submitted five years after a program receives an eight-year term of continuing accreditation. The report may address deficiencies cited in the previous VTR, and must identify significant changes to the program since the previous *Interim Progress Report* (IPR) was filed.	Section 10
Confidentiality	The duty of all visiting team members, team chairs, non-voting team members, NAAB directors, and staff to hold all	Sections 4, 5, and 6

	information designated as confidential and related to the accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture in confidence in perpetuity.	
Reconsideration	A request by a program for reconsideration of a Board action regarding a term of accreditation or of a Board decision to deny or revoke accreditation.	Section 12
Appeal	An appeal by a program regarding denial of a reconsideration decision only in the instance of a revocation decision.	Section 13
Complaint	A request by an individual to consider specific matters within an accredited program and the potential effect of a failure to address the matter on the program's compliance with the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*.	Section 11

2. **Report Formats**

   a. **Reports Prepared by Programs**

      i. **Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation**

      Purpose. The Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation serves multiple purposes:

      1. It is an analysis of the current status of the program that identifies long-term objectives for establishing and implementing the new accredited degree program.

      2. It is an analysis of the extent to which the proposed accredited program already complies with the *Conditions for Accreditation* with special emphasis on program identity, resources, and the curricular framework.

      3. It proposes a course of action for achieving initial accreditation in not more than six years. This includes, but is not limited to, the following:

         a. Plan for securing resources not already available to the proposed program (e.g., faculty, space, financial support).

         b. Securing institutional approvals for the proposed degree program (if required).

         c. Plan for recruiting and retaining students; including a scholarship program, as appropriate.

d. Plan for recruiting full-time and adjunct faculty to teach within and support the program.

e. Proposed date for enrolling the first cohort or class.

f. Projected date for awarding degrees to the first cohort or class to complete the proposed program.

g. Plan for developing and implementing new courses and/or curricular sequences, including faculty assignments and essential physical resources.

h. Plan for external support, funding, alumni engagement, and professional community engagement.

i. Plans or provisions in the event that the program does not achieve initial candidacy.

j. Plans or provisions in the event that the program does not achieve initial accreditation.

4. **Content.** The Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation should include the following:

a. Cover Page – This page should include the following information:

    i. Name of institution.

    ii. Degree program proposed (i.e., B. Arch., M. Arch., or D. Arch.), with prerequisites as appropriate (e.g., M. Arch. (preprofessional degree plus 42 graduate credits)).

    iii. Name, address, email, and telephone contact information for the following individuals:

        1. Program administrator

        2. Head of academic unit in which the program will be located

        3. Chief academic officer

        4. President of the institution

b. Part One – Analysis of the extent to which the proposed program already complies with the following *Conditions for Accreditation*, and a timeline for when these conditions will be met. NOTE: Programs seeking eligibility are not expected to comply with Part III:

    i. Part I: Sections 1-2

    ii. Part II: Sections 1-4

c. Part Two – Timeline for Achieving Initial Accreditation

d. Part Three – Supplemental Information

      i. 3.1 Course Descriptions (See *2014 Conditions,* Guide for Preparing APRs)

      ii. 3.2 Faculty Resumes (See *2014 Conditions,* Guide for Preparing APRs.)

ii. **Architecture Program Report.** *The Guide for Preparing an Architecture Program Report* (APR) is published separately from the *Procedures for Accreditation.* Please consult that document for current information regarding preparation of APRs.

1. Adjustments to an *APR for Initial Candidacy* (APR-IC).

    a. The purpose of the APR-IC is to introduce a team, composed of individuals who may have no previous knowledge of the program, to the institution and the proposed program. An *APR for Initial Candidacy* should clearly document the program's progress on the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation.

    b. The program is required to append the plan and the eligibility memorandum to the *APR for Initial Candidacy* (see Section 4, Procedures for Candidacy and Initial Accreditation).

2. Adjustments to an *APR for Continuation of Candidacy.*

    a. An *APR for Continuation of Candidacy* is similar to that for initial candidacy.

    b. The program is required to append the previous VTR, the eligibility memorandum, and the plan to the *APR for Continuation of Candidacy.*

3. Adjustments to an *APR for Initial Accreditation.*

    a. An *APR for Initial Accreditation* must introduce a team, composed of individuals with no previous knowledge of the program, to the institution and the proposed program.

    b. Further, this APR must document the full realization of the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation, including steps that may be taken after initial accreditation is achieved.

    c. All previous team reports, the eligibility memorandum, and the plan must be appended to the *APR for Initial Accreditation.*

iii. **Branch Campus Questionnaire.** Any program using one or more of the options for offsite learning described in Section 7.5 must submit a Branch Campus Questionnaire as part of any APR. In addition to the questionnaire, the program must provide a supplemental narrative

description of its branch campuses, additional sites, teaching sites, and online learning. The narrative must address the following matters:

1. Curriculum

2. Geographic location

3. Administrative structure

4. Budgetary and hiring authority and responsibilities

5. Faculty access to committee assignments, research and scholarship opportunities, and participation in professional societies

6. Student access to services and equipment, and participation in governance

7. Physical resources

The responses to the questionnaire and narrative taken together will be used by the team chair and the staff to determine what additional requirements may be added to a visit.

b. **Reports Prepared by Visiting Teams**

i. **Visiting Team Report.** The VTR serves multiple purposes. It is essential to the NAAB in making its accreditation decision; it may serve to strengthen the program and its position within the institution; and it may inform current and prospective students regarding the nature and quality of the program. VTRs are considered advisory to the NAAB Board of Directors. A generic template for VTRs can be found in Appendix 3.

1. A VTR template is prepared for each visit. This template is unique to the program being visited and will include the appropriate sections from the previous VTR.

2. The VTR conveys the visiting team's assessment of whether the program meets the *Conditions for Accreditation*, as measured by evidence of student learning, the overall capacity of the program to fulfill its obligations to ensure student achievement, and the overall learning environment. It describes the degree to which the program is functioning in the manner described in the APR. Therefore, the VTR must be concise and consistent, represent the team's consensus on all items, and include documentation on the following:

   a. The team's general observations regarding the program's unique qualities and context.

   b. The program's deficiencies with respect to the *Conditions*, including the Student Performance Criteria.

   c. Concerns about the program's future performance and/or capacity to meet its long-term strategic objectives based

13

on deficiencies or noncompliance relative to the *Conditions.*

3. **Format**. The VTR, generally speaking, includes the following:

   a. **Section I – Summary of Team Findings**

      i. **Team Acknowledgments and Observations.** This is a narrative in which the team makes general comments on the program's unique qualities and context, the APR*,* and observations and assessments of the program's compliance with the *Conditions.*

      ii. **Conditions Not Met**. This is a list of the conditions and Student Performance Criteria that the team determines are not met. The list includes only the number and title of those items not met.

      iii. **Progress since the Previous Site Visit/VTR***.* This is a narrative in which the current team reviews the program's progress against each of the not-met conditions and causes of concern from the previous visit and VTR. It is the responsibility of the current team to determine, based on its review, whether previously not-met conditions are now met and whether the causes of concern have been addressed.

   b. **Section II – Compliance with the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation**

   c. **Section III – Appendices**

      i. **Appendix A**. Conditions Met with Distinction

      ii. **Appendix B**. Team SPC Matrix (see report template for more information)

      iii. **Appendix C**. The team roster

   d. **Section IV – Report Signatures.** This page includes the signatures of all team members, including the non-voting member.

ii. **Adjustments to a VTR for Initial Candidacy**. In addition to the above, VTRs for initial and continuation of candidacy must include:

   1. Commentary by the team on the program's progress against its Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation.

   2. VTRs for initial or continuation of candidacy may also identify SPC as met, not met, or not-yet met.

a. For SPC in courses that have been offered and for which student work is in the team room for evaluation by the visiting team, the team may determine that the SPC is met or not met.

b. For SPC in courses that have not yet been offered and for which only syllabi and descriptions are available for evaluation by the team, the team may determine that the SPC is not-yet met.

iii. **Adjustments to a VTR for Initial Accreditation**. In addition to the above, the team is asked to include comments that may be helpful in preparing for future accreditation visits (if any).

iv. **Confidential Recommendation.** This is a separate document. The content is considered confidential in perpetuity and advisory to the Board. It is non-binding. In it, the team transmits a recommendation on a term of accreditation to the NAAB directors. This recommendation is signed by all members of the team, <u>except</u> the non-voting team member. The recommendation form is a template that includes the choices available to the team. The team is to complete the form with the name of the institution, the name of the degree(s), and any prerequisites in the same manner as they appear on the cover of the VTR. The team will then select the term of accreditation that they wish to recommend and sign the form. This document is to be transmitted not later than 30 calendar days after the visit ends.

Under all circumstances, this document is considered confidential in perpetuity, is advisory only, and is non-binding on the Board.

1. In the case of recommendations for initial candidacy, the team will also include a recommendation as to the length of time until the next visit either for continuing candidacy or initial accreditation. This document is considered confidential in perpetuity and is non-binding on the Board. This document is to be transmitted not later than 30 calendar days after the visit ends.

2. In the case of a recommendation for initial accreditation, the team has only two choices: to grant a three-year term of initial accreditation or to deny initial accreditation and restore the balance of a program's candidacy.

3. **Responsibilities**

a. **Responsibilities of the NAAB Office.** The NAAB staff is responsible for:

i. Ensuring that the visiting team chair, team members, and non-voting members are informed of their responsibilities.

ii. Providing the team chair and team members with the *Conditions* and the *Procedures*, and a template for completion of the VTR not less than four weeks prior to the visit.

iii. Approving all airline reservations made through the NAAB's travel system.

iv. Communicating with team members on behalf of the program. Team members are advised not to communicate with the program directly; this is the responsibility of the NAAB staff and the team chair.

v. Billing programs for the expenses of the visiting team. These invoices will be sent not later than July 1 for visits that took place during the spring, and not later than February 1 for visits that took place in the fall. The NAAB will provide the following supporting documentation:

1. Copies of invoices or itineraries for air travel or other transportation.

2. Copies of receipts for ground transportation, including rental cars.

3. Copies of receipts for all meals and other expenses (except mileage).

b. **Responsibilities of the Team Members**. Team members are responsible for:

i. Contacting the NAAB office to confirm their participation in the site visit not less than <u>four weeks before the visit.</u>

ii. Promptly suggesting any revisions to the VTR.

iii. Reviewing Section 8, Conflicts of Interest, and verifying to the NAAB office and the team chair that no conflict of interest exists, or disclosing potential conflicts so they can be managed appropriately.

iv. Making air travel arrangements in advance to secure economical fares.

v. Reviewing the *Conditions* and the *Procedures,* the program's APR*,* the template for the VTR, and the visiting team members' resumes in advance of the visit.

vi. Participating in two pre-visit conference calls and review of documentary material as described in Section 5, Procedures for Continuing Accreditation.

vii. Actively participating in or observing, as assigned, all aspects of the visit and carrying out all tasks assigned by the visiting team chair with integrity and timeliness, including review of material in the team room.

viii. Participating in writing the draft of the VTR.

ix. Completing an initial draft of the VTR prior to the beginning of the exit interviews.

x. Holding information in strictest confidence as specified in these *Procedures.*

xi. Notifying the NAAB office immediately in the event of a personal emergency that renders a team member unable to fulfill his/her responsibilities. In the event that a team member withdraws from a team

less than 30 days prior to the visit for reasons other than a personal or health emergency, he/she will be permanently removed from the pool of potential team members.

xii. Completing and submitting a reimbursement request in a timely manner.

    1. A copy of the reimbursement form can be found on the NAAB website in the Documents section in the team room folder.

    2. Requests for reimbursement must be submitted within 30 days of the end of the visit. Requests for reimbursement must include:

        a. Invoice/itinerary for transportation (air or rail).

        b. Receipts for ground transportation, including rental cars.

        c. Receipts for all meals and incidental expenses (except mileage).

    3. Any reimbursement item that does not have an accompanying receipt will not be honored, and the total amount of the reimbursement will be adjusted accordingly.

    4. Requests for reimbursement submitted more than 30 days after the end of the visit must be reviewed by the NAAB executive committee before being processed.

    5. In the event that an individual has already completed his/her travel reservations and must withdraw from the team, he/she will be invoiced for the expense of the travel.

    6. In the event that an individual has already completed his/her travel reservations and must reschedule his/her air transportation in order to ensure attendance for the entire visit, he/she will be invoiced for any change fees assessed by the airline.

    7. The NAAB will not reimburse team members for alcoholic beverages, personal items, or entertainment.

xiii. Completing the required NAAB team training program prior to being assigned to a visiting team.

xiv. Completing the required NAAB assessment and evaluation survey within 10 days of completing the visit.

c. **Responsibilities of the Team Chairs**

    i. The visiting team chair is responsible for the following:

        1. Setting the date for the visit with the program administrator.

        2. Reviewing the APR and identifying needs for additional information, or requesting changes to the report.

        3. Developing the agenda for the visit with the program administrator.

4. Consulting with the program administrator on the format and content of the team room.

5. Hosting mandatory pre-visit conference calls with the team prior to the visit (see Section 5, Procedures for Continuing Accreditation).

6. Preparing the final draft of the *Visiting Team Report* (see above) and sending it to the NAAB office within 30 days of the last day of the visit.

7. Securing the signatures of all team members on the report.

8. Securing the signatures of all team members on the confidential recommendation page.

9. Ensuring the team's compliance with the *Procedures for Accreditation* and appropriate standards of conduct during the visit.

10. Attending team chair training.

11. Completing the required NAAB assessment and evaluation survey(s) within 10 days of submitting the VTR.

d. **Responsibilities of the School/Program**. The program is responsible for:

   i. Making all hotel and lodging arrangements for the team. This includes ensuring that reasonable accommodation has been made for persons with disabilities. Lodging is to be secured 30 days prior to the beginning of the visit. The information is to be sent to the team chair.

   ii. Notifying the NAAB office not less than 30 days prior to the visit of any specific requirements for documentation to support invoices for team expenses (e.g., boarding passes).

   If the program fails to notify the NAAB office before the team arrives, the program will be responsible for securing the necessary documentation from the team members.

   iii. Unless otherwise agreed to by the program administrator and the team chair, the program is responsible for all ground transportation during the visit. This includes transportation to and from the airport and all local transportation.

   iv. Providing team members with copies of the APR in digital format not less than 60 days prior to the first day of the visit.

   v. Providing original work for accreditation purposes in the team room.

   vi. Ensuring completion of the required NAAB assessment and evaluation survey(s) by the program administrator within 10 days of the end of the visit.

4. **Fees, Expenses, and Fines**

   a. **Expenses for Visiting Teams**. The program is responsible for all expenses for visiting teams. This includes visits for continuing accreditation, eligibility for candidacy, initial candidacy, initial accreditation, and program changes. Programs will receive invoices, addressed to the program administrator, on or about July 1 following a spring visit and February 1 following a fall visit. Generally, these are sent by the USPS and include all required or requested documentation. Programs have 30 days in which to process and pay the invoices. Accreditation decisions will not be released to the programs until all invoices are paid.

   b. **Fines for Late APRs**. APRs are due each year on September 7. For each calendar day after September 7 that passes until the APR is received, the program will be assessed a fine of $100.00 per calendar day. This fine will be included on the invoice for the expenses of the visiting team.

   c. **Fines for Late Annual Reports**. *Annual Statistical Reports* are due each year on November 30. In the event that a program fails to complete the *Annual Statistical Report* on time, including not more than one extension, the program will be assessed a fine of $100.00 per calendar day until the missing report(s) is submitted.

   This fine is assessed as a unique invoice sent to the program administrator. Programs have 30 days to process and pay the invoice. Failure to pay the invoice will result in lack of access to the Annual Report Submission (ARS) system and removal of the program from the NAAB's website listing of accredited programs.

   d. **Fine for Late Interim Progress Reports**. *Interim Progress Reports a*re due on November 30 two years after either a four-year or eight-year term of accreditation is approved. In the event that a program fails to submit the *Interim Progress Reports* on time, including not more than one extension, the program will be assessed a fine of $100.00 per calendar day until the missing report is submitted.

   This fine is assessed as a unique invoice sent to the program administrator. Programs have 30 days to process and pay the invoice. Failure to pay the invoice will result in suspension of the review process for that program's IPR, lack of access to the ARS, and removal of the program from the NAAB's website listing of accredited programs.

5. **Team Member Pool.** Individuals may be added to the NAAB team member pool through two processes:

   a. **Organizational Nominations.** Individuals may be nominated to the NAAB team member pool by one of the following organizations: the ACSA, AIA, NCARB, or AIAS. These organizations set the timeline and process by which individuals are selected and nominated for the team member pool. Generally, all organizational nominations must be submitted to the NAAB by April 15.

    i. All organizational nominations are to be accompanied by a team member nomination form and resume or curriculum vitae (see Appendix 1).

    ii. Organizational nominees remain in the pool for a period of four years beginning January 1 of the year after their names were submitted to the NAAB. During this time, they may be called upon for any visit.

    iii. All organizational nominees must complete team member training.

b. **Self-Nominations.** Individuals may self-nominate into the NAAB team member pool annually between January 1 and March 31.

    i. All self-nominations must include a letter of intent, a nomination form (see Appendix 1), and a resume or curriculum vitae. The letter must describe how the candidate's professional and academic experiences have prepared him/her to participate in NAAB activities.

    ii. All self-nominations must also have letters of endorsement from at least two of the following:

        1. AIA Component president, national officer, or national director

        2. NCARB member board chair, national officer, or national director

        3. ACSA national officer or director

        4. Dean or program administrator at an institution with a NAAB-accredited program

        5. AIAS chapter president, national officer, or national director

    iii. All self-nominated team members remain in the pool for a period of four years beginning January 1 of the year after they submitted their names to the NAAB. During this time, they may be called upon for any visit.

    iv. All self-nominated team members must complete team member training.

SECTION 3. TERMS OF ACCREDITATION

Types/Terms of Accreditation

Although there are minor distinctions among the procedures that apply to initial candidacy, initial accreditation, continuing accreditation, or reinstated accreditation, the sequence is similar for all institutions seeking NAAB action.

Actions on stages and terms of accreditation are taken at regularly scheduled meetings of the Board of Directors, except where noted. In all cases, any motion regarding an accreditation action must have at least eight votes in favor to pass.

Unless specifically noted in the Board's decision, all terms of accreditation are effective on January 1 of the year in which the visit took place. Conversely, all terms of accreditation expire on January 1 of the year in which a visit is scheduled to take place unless and until the NAAB approves a motion for a term of accreditation.

1. **STAGE I: Candidacy**. Institutions seeking initial accreditation for a professional degree program in architecture must first be granted candidacy status by the NAAB. Institutions intending to establish a professional degree program should seek guidance from the NAAB for assistance in reviewing the appropriate sections of this document before proceeding with the development of a candidacy application.

    a. Programs seeking candidacy may be granted a period of candidacy of not less than two years. The program must achieve initial accreditation under Section 2.2.a.i of this document within six years of the effective date of the term of initial candidacy.

    b. The eligibility requirements for initial candidacy are defined in Section 4, Procedures for Candidacy and Initial Accreditation of this document.

    c. The maximum period of initial candidacy is six years. Should a program fail to achieve initial accreditation within the maximum period, it must submit a new candidacy application (see Section 4).

2. **STAGE II: Initial Accreditation**. All visits for initial accreditation will take place in the fall semester following the graduation of the first cohort of students to complete the full curriculum. The term of initial accreditation will be granted as follows:

    a. The effective date of initial accreditation will be set as January 1 of the year in which the visit took place.

    b. The eligibility requirements for initial accreditation are defined in Section 4 of this document.

    c. The term of initial accreditation is three years from the year of the visit.

    Schools should work with the NAAB to establish a calendar for candidacy and initial accreditation.

    Programs that received a term of initial accreditation before January 1, 2011, will not have the effective dates of their terms of initial accreditation adjusted retroactively.

    Initial accreditation is probationary in nature and indicates that, although deficiencies may be present, the institution has established plans and is making sufficient progress

toward addressing or removing the deficiencies by the time of the first visit for continuing accreditation under Section 2.2.a.i.

In the event that the program fails to achieve initial accreditation, the balance of its candidacy period may be restored. If the remaining period of candidacy is less than two years, the program will be required to submit a new application for initial candidacy, although some steps in the process may be waived.

3. **STAGE III: First Term of Continuing Accreditation Following a Term of Initial Accreditation**

    a. The first visit for continuing accreditation will be three years from the year in which the visit for initial accreditation was conducted.

    b. Programs that have achieved a term of initial accreditation may only receive an eight-year term of accreditation under Section 2.4.a.i as a result of the Board's decision following the first visit for continuing accreditation, or accreditation will be revoked.

    c. Failure to receive an eight-year term of accreditation under Section 2.2.a.i indicates that the program failed to meet the plans established for its initial accreditation, failed to make sufficient progress toward addressing or removing deficiencies identified during the visit for initial accreditation, or has new deficiencies, such that continuing accreditation is not warranted. Programs that are seeking their first term of continuing accreditation, but fail to receive an-eight-year term and, therefore, have the program's accreditation revoked, and that wish to continue to seek accreditation may reapply for initial candidacy.

4. **STAGE IV: Subsequent Terms of Continuing Accreditation**. Programs that have completed the first term of continuing accreditation and are seeking a subsequent term of continuing accreditation may receive one of the following terms of accreditation, or accreditation may be revoked:

    a. **Eight-Year Term**. This term indicates that deficiencies, if any, are minor, and the intent to correct them is ensured. The program is accredited for an eight-year period.

    b. **Four-Year Term**. This term indicates that major deficiencies are present in at least three of the following areas at the time of the current visit and may also have been present at the time of the previous visit:

        Learning Culture

        Social Equity

        Long-Range Planning

        Assessment

        Human Resources and Human Resource Development

        Physical Resources

        Financial Resources

        Information Resources

Student Performance Criteria

Additionally, a program may receive a reduced term if any single SPC has been identified as not met for a second, consecutive accreditation visit.

In the event that a team finds an SPC not met for a second, consecutive visit, the VTR must include a record of the team's efforts to be thorough in its assessment. Further, the program is required to provide a response to the team's assessment when it submits corrections of fact for the VTR (see p. 57).

i. Multiple deficiencies in these areas sufficiently affect the quality of the program, and a full accreditation review is required after less than eight years. At the next scheduled review following a first four-year term, the program may receive an eight-year term, a second four-year term, or a two-year probationary term.

ii. At the next scheduled review following a second, consecutive four-year term, the program may receive either an eight-year term or a two-year probationary term. No more than two, consecutive four-year terms can be awarded to a program.

c. **Two-Year Probationary Term**. This term indicates that the deficiencies are severe enough to have eroded the quality of the program and that the intent or capability to correct these deficiencies is not evident.

i. The program is on probation and must show cause for the continuance of its accreditation.

ii. At its next scheduled review, the program must receive at least a four-year term or accreditation will be revoked.

iii. The next scheduled review of a program that has received a two-year probationary term usually will be conducted by a team consisting of three former NAAB directors and a person not from the NAAB.

iv. At the next scheduled review following a two-year probationary term, the program must receive at least a four-year term of accreditation. Consecutive, two-year probationary terms cannot be awarded to a program.

v. If a four-year term follows a two-year probationary term, the program must receive an eight-year term at the next scheduled review or accreditation will be revoked.

d. **Revocation of Accreditation**. This indicates that insufficient progress was made during a two-year probationary term to warrant a four-year term.

Accreditation may also be revoked if the team observes substantial and uncorrectable noncompliance with the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* during any site visit.

Accreditation may be revoked if no *Architecture Program Report* is submitted for a visit for continuing accreditation already on the schedule.

Finally, any program that phases out a program without first filing a plan for phasing out the NAAB-accredited degree will be considered to have forfeited accreditation of the professional degree in architecture, and accreditation will be revoked. The effective date of revocation will be December 31 of the year in which the institution began the phase-out of the program (see Section 6, Substantive Changes that Require Review by the NAAB, for more information).

SECTION 4. PROCEDURES FOR CANDIDACY AND INITIAL ACCREDITATION

Initial candidacy and initial accreditation for a new professional degree program in architecture requires the completion of five important steps that are reviewed by the NAAB staff and the NAAB directors.

For institutions that already have at least one NAAB-accredited professional degree program, some of these steps may be waived or modified. Generally, the steps are as follows:

1. Application to establish candidacy status
2. Determination of eligibility
3. Initial candidacy visit
4. Subsequent evaluations toward accreditation
5. Initial accreditation

Schools should work with the NAAB to establish a calendar for candidacy and initial accreditation.

Consultation and Support

Institutions interested in establishing a NAAB-accredited, professional degree program in architecture are encouraged to contact the NAAB staff, administrators and faculty members from institutions with NAAB-accredited degree programs, the ACSA, and professional consultants for advice and counsel in selecting appropriate degree types and for assistance in preparing the necessary documentation, especially the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation.

If an institution seeks to establish more than one NAAB-accredited program, the applications must be made separately. The NAAB will not accept applications for candidacy for more than one program at a time from the same institution.

The period from candidacy to initial accreditation may vary, but is no longer than six years. Should a program fail to achieve initial accreditation within the maximum period, it must submit a new candidacy application.

1. **Candidacy Application.** Institutions seeking initial accreditation for a professional degree program in architecture must first be granted candidacy status by the NAAB. The first step in achieving candidacy status is to submit an application for candidacy. A complete application must include the following:

   a. A letter from the institution's chief academic officer announcing the intention to seek candidacy for accreditation for a professional degree program in architecture. The letter should include the specific degree name (i.e., B. Arch., M. Arch., or D. Arch.) along with any prerequisites and the total number of credits to be awarded.

   b. The most recent decision letter from the recognized U.S. regional accrediting agency for the institution (see *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation,* Part II: Section 2.1, Regional Accreditation).

   c. The Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation (see Section 2, General Information).

   d. Applications may be submitted in electronic format only.

i. Applications are limited to 75 pages, including all supplemental information. They are to be sent either in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF and are limited to 3 MBs.

ii. Applications are to be addressed to the Director, Accreditation, NAAB.

By email: info@naab.org with a copy to forum@naab.org. Please include "Application for Candidacy" and the name of the institution in the subject line.

2. **Determination of Eligibility**. The second step toward becoming a candidate program is for the NAAB to determine whether the proposed degree program is eligible for candidacy. The process used for determining eligibility is based on whether the institution already offers a NAAB-accredited degree and is seeking to develop another one, or whether the institution has no NAAB-accredited programs.

   a. **Review of the Application**. The NAAB executive director or director, accreditation will review the application to determine whether it is complete. Once the application is complete, a review panel will be named.

   b. **Membership of the Review Panel.** The review panel consists of the NAAB executive director or the director, accreditation and two members of the Board of Directors, with at least one being an educator.

   c. **Responsibilities of the Review Panel**. The panel will review the application and conduct an eligibility visit if necessary and determine whether to recommend that the Board accept the program as eligible.

      i. For programs seeking candidacy for a professional degree program in architecture that **do not** currently have a NAAB-accredited degree program:

         1. The application will be reviewed by the panel, and an eligibility visit will be scheduled (see paragraph d).

         2. After completion of the eligibility visit, a memorandum will be prepared (see paragraph e).

      ii. For programs that already offer at least one NAAB-accredited degree and are seeking candidacy for an additional professional degree program (e.g., an institution with an accredited B. Arch. is seeking to establish an accredited M. Arch.):

         1. The application will be reviewed by the panel, and additional information may be requested.

         2. Once the panel has completed its review of the documentation provided by the institution, a report will be prepared (see paragraph e).

   d. **Eligibility Visit**

      i. **Purpose.** There are three purposes for the eligibility visit:

         1. To review the physical, financial, human, and information resources committed to the program.

2. To confirm the institutional commitment to the implementation of the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation.

3. To review the *Conditions* and the *Procedures* with the proposed program's administrators, faculty, staff, and students.

ii. **Format**

1. Eligibility visits are to last not more than two days.

2. The visit will be undertaken by any one of the individuals assigned to the review panel.

3. The visit will be scheduled on two consecutive weekdays.

4. The visit should include the following:

   a. Presentation by the program on the history and mission of the institution, academic/administrative unit, and proposed degree program.

   b. Discussion between the reviewer and the program administrator to review the *NAAB Conditions* and *Procedures.*

   c. Separate meetings with faculty, staff, and students.

   d. Meetings with division administrators (e.g., department chair and dean) and the chief academic officer.

   e. Meetings with the institution's chief academic officer, chief financial officer, and chief advancement officer.

   f. Opportunities to observe classes and studios (if courses are being offered that will be included in the proposed degree program).

   g. A tour of the physical resources that are or will be designated for the program (studios, classrooms, seminar rooms, shops, and labs).

   h. A tour of the library or other information resource center(s) that support the program.

   i. Optional: A meeting with alumni of the institution and local architects. This meeting is only recommended for institutions seeking to develop an existing preprofessional program into an accredited professional degree program.

e. **Report from the Review Panel.** Following the documentary review and, if necessary, the eligibility visit, the panel must submit a memorandum to the Board of Directors that documents observations and conclusions. The report must include the following:

   i. A review of the resources committed to the program.

      ii.   Commitment of the institution to the implementation of the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation.

      iii. Assessment of the readiness of the program to complete a visit for initial candidacy.

      iv. In the case where an institution already offers a NAAB-accredited program, this memorandum may cross-reference the findings of the visiting team in the most recent VTR.

      v.   Recommendation to the NAAB Board to accept or not accept the program as eligible for initial candidacy. The recommendation will also identify the length of time that should elapse before scheduling the initial candidacy visit.

  f. **Board Action on Eligibility for Initial Candidacy**

      i.   The panel's recommendation is presented to the Board at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

      ii.   If the Board approves a motion to accept the program as eligible for initial candidacy, the NAAB staff will select a visiting team chair and advise the program to compile an *Architecture Program Report for Initial Candidacy* (APR-IC) and prepare for an initial candidacy visit as outlined below.

      iii. If the Board does not accept the program as eligible for initial candidacy, the program leadership will be advised. The program may submit a new application. There is a one-year waiting period before a new application can be submitted.

  g. **Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation.** See Section 2.2.a.i for the format for the plan.

3. **Initial Candidacy.** Once a program has been accepted as eligible for initial candidacy, a site visit for initial candidacy will be scheduled. With certain exceptions, visits for initial candidacy are similar to those for continuing accreditation. The first step is the preparation of an *Architecture Program Report for Initial Candidacy* (APR-IC) and preparation for a visiting team.

  a. **Architecture Program Report Submitted for Initial Candidacy Visits**

      i.   **Purpose.** The *Architecture Program Report for Initial Candidacy* (APR-IC) is similar to an APR for continuing accreditation. See Section 2.2, Report Formats.

      ii.   **Submission.** *APRs for Initial Candidacy* are to be submitted in electronic format only.

            1. APR-ICs are limited to 250 pages, including all parts. The page limit does not include the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation or the eligibility memorandum.

            2. Electronic versions of the APR-IC are to be prepared either in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF and are limited to 7 MBs.

3. APR-ICs are submitted through the NAAB's integrated information management system.

iii. **Review and Acceptance**

1. The APR-IC is first reviewed by the NAAB staff to ensure that it is complete.

2. The APR-IC is then reviewed by the team chair for completeness and clarity, to discern the complexity of the program's structure, and to identify issues that may affect the duration of, and agenda for, the site visit. The visiting team chair's review results in a recommendation to the NAAB staff to do one of the following:

    a. Accept the APR-IC and schedule the site visit.

    b. Accept the APR-IC, schedule the site visit, and request additional information before the visit.

    c. Require additional information to be submitted not less than 60 days before the scheduled visit date. The date will be confirmed after the additional information is received, reviewed, and determined to be acceptable.

    d. Reject the APR-IC and require a new report to be submitted for review not less than 45 days prior to the date for the visit. If the new APR-IC is considered acceptable, the visit will take place.

        i. Should the chair recommend that the APR-IC be rejected, the APR-IC and the chair's review are brought before the NAAB Board of Directors for review and action.

        ii. Should the school fail to deliver an acceptable amended or replacement APR-IC, the chief academic officer of the institution is notified that the candidacy visit will have to be postponed until the next semester. A new chair will be appointed and a new team assembled.

3. APR-ICs are due in the NAAB office 180 days before the visit is scheduled to take place.

    a. For APR-ICs sent in September, the review of the APR-ICs must be completed before the regularly scheduled fall meeting of the NAAB Board of Directors.

    b. For APR-ICs submitted in the spring, the review must be completed before the regularly scheduled summer meeting of the NAAB Board of Directors.

    c. New APR-ICs (if they are requested) are due not less than 45 days prior to the date for the visit.

iv. **Dissemination of the APR-IC to the Public Prior to the Visit**. To stimulate broad-based participation, the program is encouraged to distribute the APR-IC within the school community before and during the site visit. However, the APR-IC is not to be shared with the general public until after the final decision is communicated by the NAAB (see Section 4.3.i).

b. **Visiting Teams**

i. **Composition of Teams for Initial or Continuing Candidacy**

1. Teams for initial and continuation of candidacy visits are composed of three individuals: an educator, a practitioner, and an individual selected from a pool of former NAAB directors and NAAB staff directors. Either the educator or the practitioner will be designated by the NAAB directors to serve as the team chair.

2. Teams are composed by the NAAB staff after the date for the visit has been set by the team chair and the program administrator. The NAAB makes every effort to ensure that the team is balanced regarding geography, gender, race/ethnicity, and accreditation experience. In addition, the staff makes every effort to ensure that no one proposed as a member of a visiting team has a real or perceived conflict of interest as defined in Section 8, Conflicts of Interest. To the extent possible, teams are selected so that not more than one person is on his/her first visit.

3. Team members are advised of their preliminary selection for a specific visit with the understanding that final approval of the team is the responsibility of the program.

ii. **Team Chair.** Visiting team chairs for candidacy visits are selected in the same manner as those for continuing accreditation visits (see Section 5, Procedures for Continuing Accreditation).

NAAB staff notify program administrators once a chair has been nominated. The administrator may challenge the nomination on the basis of potential conflicts of interest (see Section 8). Once the chair has been confirmed, the administrator and the chair work together to select a date for the visit.

iii. **Non-Voting Member.** Non-voting members are not permitted on teams for initial candidacy or on subsequent teams to determine the continuation of candidacy.

iv. **Notification to Program**. The NAAB staff notifies the program administrator when a full team has been assembled. The program administrator is responsible for determining whether any member of the team poses a real or potential conflict of interest. See Section 8 for additional information.

v. **Challenges to Team Members**. Programs may challenge no more than one member of a proposed visiting team for initial or continuation of

candidacy, under the terms of Section 8, Conflicts of Interest. Such challenges are to be made in writing within five days of receiving notice of the nomination of a chair or the membership of a visiting team.

Challenges will be reviewed by the NAAB executive director and the director, accreditation. Where challenges are permitted to stand, a new team member will be assigned. Challenges will not be accepted less than 21 days prior to the start of an accreditation visit.

c. **Scheduling the Dates for the Site Visit**

   i. The dates for a visit for initial candidacy are set by the team chair and the program administrator in consultation.

   ii. Generally, spring visits take place between the last week of January and the first week of April each year; fall visits take place between the second week of September and the last week of October.

   iii. Once a date has been set and a team proposed, the date cannot be changed.

   iv. Duration of the visit:

       1. Visits for initial candidacy begin on Saturday evening and end the following Tuesday at noon.

       2. If the program is still in the early stages of implementation and the amount of student work available for review is limited, the visit may begin on Sunday evening and end the following Tuesday at noon. The final decision on the length of the visit is made by the team chair in consultation with the program administrator and the NAAB staff.

       3. All members of the team are expected to participate in the visit the entire time.

       4. If the program seeking candidacy is to be offered in more than one location, the team chair may arrive early in order to visit other locations for the program. These exceptions are agreed to by the team chair and the program administrator with advice from the NAAB staff. See Section 7, Special Circumstances for additional information on visits with special circumstances.

d. **Schedule/Agenda for Each Visit for Initial Candidacy.** The visit agenda for initial candidacy is similar to that for continuing accreditation (see Section 5, Procedures for Continuing Accreditation). Differences are noted below. Each visit must include, at a minimum, the following:

   i. **Prior to the Visit.** See Section 5, Procedures for Continuing Accreditation.

   ii. **Onsite**

       1. **Tours**. Same as for continuing accreditation (see p. 51).

2. **Meetings.** NOTE: All meetings are confidential, informal discussions, **not** presentations.

   a. **Staff**. Same as for continuing accreditation (see p. 51).

   b. **Program Head**. Same as for continuing accreditation (see p. 52).

   c. **Entrance Meetings with the School or College Administrator, Chief Academic Officer, Faculty, and Students**. Same as for continuing accreditation (see p. 52), except as noted below.

      NOTE: It is very likely that, at the time of a visit for initial candidacy, no students will have enrolled in the program. A meeting with students or student leaders is only required during visits for continuation of candidacy or when an institution is augmenting an existing degree program in order to achieve accreditation. When a visit for initial or continuing candidacy includes a meeting with students, these are to be conducted without the presence of any administrators, staff, or faculty, and should be arranged so that all students can attend.

   d. **Optional: Contact with Graduates and Local Practitioners**. This meeting is optional. It is only recommended when an institution is proposing to expand an existing preprofessional program into an accredited degree program or during visits for continuation of candidacy. Attendees may include recent and past graduates, local registration board members, and representatives of the AIA chapter.

3. **Review of Student Work**. Visits for initial candidacy are unlikely to include student work, unless the institution is proposing to expand or augment an existing program. In the case where student work is available, team members are individually and jointly responsible for assessing the work in the team room and elsewhere.

4. **Observation of Studios, Lectures, and Seminars**. This is only required when courses currently being offered are or will be part of the proposed professional degree program.

5. **Review of Student Records and Transfer Credit Assessment**. This review is the same as for continuing accreditation (see p. 52).

6. **Debriefing Sessions**. Daily, the team meets to evaluate its progress, adjust assignments, and assess the need for additional information.

7. **Deliberation and Drafting the VTR**. This is the same as for continuing accreditation (see p. 52).

8. **Exit interviews**. The form and content of exit interviews are the same as for continuing accreditation (see p. 53). The team is required to leave the institution as soon as the last interview is completed.

e. **Team Room.** Before the site visit, the program head and visiting team chair discuss the content and organization of the team room.

   i. **Purpose**. The purpose of the team room is the same as for visits for continuing accreditation. See Section 5, Procedures for Continuing Accreditation for additional information.

   ii. **Contents**. The team room must contain fully labeled and easily accessible exhibits of student work, if available. Materials used as exhibits must include examples of both the minimum passing assessment and high achievement; be of sufficient quantity to ensure that all graduates are meeting the performance criteria; and have been executed by students enrolled in the proposed program (this may not be necessary for an initial candidacy visit, but will be necessary for subsequent visits for continuation of candidacy). In all cases, student work should be presented in the form in which it was evaluated by the instructor. Where student work was turned in using electronic format, the program must provide the applications used to create the work in order for the team to review it. Where courses have not yet been offered, please provide course descriptions that include learning outcomes and their correlation to the SPC. The team room must also contain the following:

      1. **Student Studio Work**. The majority of the visual material should be presented in a format that is easily sorted and reviewed. The studio work must represent the full range of approaches taken and assignments made by various faculty, and must include syllabi, project statements or assignments, handouts, bibliographies, and corresponding samples of student drawings and models. In addition to final projects, in-progress work and student journals may be included.

         While a range of work must be displayed for each required course, it is not necessary to present the complete output of a studio, lecture, or seminar.

         The organization of student work is left to the discretion of the program in consultation with the team chair, but each piece must cross-reference the course matrix and criteria it addresses, be dated, and indicate its assessment from minimum passing assessment to high achievement. Ideally, examples by several different students or teams should be furnished.

      2. **Course Notebooks**. A notebook must be provided for each required and elective course (i.e., optional studies, see *2014 Conditions*), including studio courses. The notebooks for required courses must contain a syllabus showing weekly activities and

assignments, a bibliography, quizzes and examinations, where applicable, and corresponding samples of student work. The notebook must also contain a statistical summary of achievement by all students in the course. The notebooks for optional studies must include syllabi and other materials that the program deems important.

During a visit for initial or continuation of candidacy, notebooks should be provided for courses that have not yet been offered, but for which syllabi and other materials have been prepared.

These may be presented either in digital or hard copy format. If the notebooks are in digital format, they should be presented either as PDFs on a shared drive or digital platform (e.g., Google Docs or Dropbox), or as an interactive site. The program must provide usernames and passwords to the team, if needed to access the files.

3. **Student Admissions and Advising Files.** These are copies of files for students admitted to the program, with identifying information removed, that demonstrate the process by which students are admitted to the program and how, if appropriate, advanced standing is determined (see *2014 Conditions for Accreditation*, Part II: Section 3).

4. **Team Work Area**. The team room must contain a conference table, with enough seating to accommodate the entire team.

5. **Access**. The team room must be secure; the only keys are to be given to the members of the team. No one other than the team is to be in the room, except at the team's invitation.

6. **Equipment**. The room must contain the following: a document shredder, viewing/projection equipment as requested by the visiting team chair, Internet access, a printer, and a sufficient number of electrical outlets and types of outlets.

7. **Visit Agenda and Resumes**. The visit agenda and resumes of the team should be posted near the team room for public review.

8. **Faculty Photos**. Faculty photos should be made available to the team either in hard copy or electronically.

9. **Matrices**
   a. A large copy of the faculty credentials matrix for the current semester, as described in the *Guide to Preparing APRs* should be posted in the team room.

   b. A large copy of the SPC matrix, described in Part II: Section 1, Student Performance Criteria, *Conditions for Accreditation*, should be posted in the team room.

10. **Additional Information**. See Section 5, pp. 55-56.

11. **Optional Faculty Exhibit.** See Section 5, p. 56 of this document for additional information.

f. **Candidacy-Visiting Team Report (C-VTR)**

    i. **Review/Acceptance/Transmittal by the Team**. The team chair must transmit a final draft of the C-VTR to the NAAB office not later than 30 calendar days after the visit ends. The team chair is responsible for completing the draft and collecting additional input or suggested text from the other members of the team.

    ii. **Review by NAAB Staff**. Upon receiving the draft from the team chair, the NAAB staff reviews the draft report and makes corrections for grammar, spelling, and punctuation. In addition, the report is reviewed for completeness and comprehension and to ensure that the team has not offered advice or recommendations for changes or modifications to the program. Any requests for clarification or adjustments are reviewed with the team chair. Once any changes have been made or approved by the chair, the draft is sent to the program administrator.

    iii. **Corrections of Fact**. The program administrator is then asked to review the draft C-VTR to make corrections of fact only. These corrections are to be transmitted to the NAAB staff, who, in turn, review the corrections. The team chair has 10 calendar days to accept or reject the corrections of fact and resubmit a final C-VTR.

    iv. **Optional Response**. The final C-VTR is transmitted to the program administrator, who has the option to write a response.

    v. **Dates and Deadlines**

        1. Every effort is made to make VTRs available for review by the NAAB directors 60 days after a visit ends.

            a. Within 30 days of the last day of the visit, the team chair sends the draft C-VTR and the confidential recommendation to the NAAB staff.

            b. The NAAB staff completes the initial edits and corrections in consultation with the chair, and sends the draft C-VTR to the program administrator.

            c. Within 10 calendar days of receiving the draft C-VTR, the program submits corrections of fact. Corrections sent after the deadline will not be accepted.

            d. Within 10 calendar days of receiving the corrections of fact, the NAAB staff and team chair accept or reject the corrections and complete the final C-VTR.

            e. The NAAB staff transmits the final C-VTR to the program administrator for an optional response.

f. Within 10 calendar days of receiving the final C-VTR, the program sends its optional response to the NAAB office. Responses sent after the deadline will not be forwarded to the Board.

2. At least 21 calendar days before the next meeting of the NAAB Board of Directors, the NAAB staff prepares the final report dossier for the directors' review. This package contains the following documents in this order:

   a. Executive summary

   b. Final C-VTR

   c. Confidential recommendation

   d. Optional program response

   e. Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation

   f. Eligibility memorandum

g. **Decision of the Board of Directors**. At the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting, the final report dossier is presented to the Board of Directors for a decision.

h. **Transmitting the Decision of the Board of Directors**. Within 14 calendar days of a Board decision regarding a term of initial candidacy, a letter announcing the decision is sent to the president of the institution, with copies to the program administrator, the team chair, and the team members. This letter is sent by overnight delivery. Decisions to deny candidacy are not subject to reconsideration or appeal. The letter transmitting a decision to deny initial candidacy will include advice for reapplying.

i. **Confidentiality.** The team must maintain strict confidentiality with respect to materials reviewed, interviews conducted, and team deliberations, including the team's recommendation on a term of initial or continuing candidacy in perpetuity. The team bases its assessment of the program, in part, on interviews with various constituencies of the program. All individual and group interviews are confidential, and the information obtained from them is for the exclusive use of the team in preparing its report and recommendation.

Before the candidacy decision, both the NAAB and the program are prohibited from making either the APR-IC or the C-VTR available to the collateral organizations or the public.

j. **Public Disclosure of Accreditation Outcomes**

   i. After the candidacy decision, the program is required to disseminate the APR-IC, the final C-VTR and all attachments, and the current editions of the *Conditions* and the *Procedures* and any addenda. These documents must be hosted on the program's website and be freely accessible to all.

      ii. Unless written permission is obtained from the NAAB, the program may disseminate only complete copies of the *Conditions* and the *Procedures* and any addenda, and the C-VTR.

      iii. The program is required to provide faculty and incoming students with access to the current Student Performance Criteria and related accreditation documents (see *2014 Conditions for Accreditation,* Part II: Section 4, Public Information).

      iv. The NAAB publishes all VTRs at www.naab.org after accreditation decisions are made. These are published with the program's response and without the confidential recommendation of the team.

      v. The accreditation decisions for a given year are published in the NAAB's *Annual Report.* In addition, they are made available to the collateral organizations and the public, and to other organizations upon request.

      vi. Within 30 calendar days of a decision to deny candidacy, the NAAB will notify the collateral organizations and the appropriate regional accrediting agency.

4. **Subsequent Evaluations**. Continuation of candidacy is subject to submission of *Annual Statistical Reports* (see Section 9, Annual Statistical Reports) and visits at two-year intervals until initial accreditation is achieved. The reporting, team composition, and visit requirements for each subsequent visit are the same as for initial candidacy.

5. **Procedures for Initial Accreditation**

Once a program has achieved initial candidacy and completed a minimum number of years in candidacy status (see below), it is eligible to apply for initial accreditation of its professional degree program. For institutions that already have at least one NAAB-accredited professional degree program, some of these steps may be waived or modified. Generally, the steps are as follows:

    1. Request for initial accreditation

    2. Initial accreditation visit

All visits for initial accreditation take place in the fall semester or quarter following the graduation of the first cohort of students to complete the program.

Terms of Accreditation and Graduates from the Program

Terms of initial accreditation may only be three years (see Section 3.2).

In order to meet the education requirement set forth by the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB), an applicant for an NCARB Certificate must hold a professional degree in architecture from a program accredited by the NAAB; the degree must have been awarded not more than two years prior to initial accreditation.

The "two-year rule," as it is sometimes called, is promulgated by NCARB. The full text can be found in the *Guidelines for Certification* in the statement defining the education requirement for an NCARB Certificate.

In practical terms, this means that, if a program receives an initial term of accreditation effective January 1, 2008, for example, individuals who graduated after January 1, 2006, are considered to have met the education requirement for an NCARB Certificate. However, meeting the education requirement for the NCARB Certificate may not be equivalent to meeting the education requirement for registration in a specific jurisdiction. Programs are strongly urged to keep this in mind when developing timelines for achieving initial accreditation.

a. **Eligibility for Initial Accreditation**

    i. Programs seeking initial accreditation for a professional degree program in architecture that **do not** currently offer a NAAB-accredited degree program must **by the time of the visit** for initial accreditation:

        1. Have completed four years in continuous candidacy.

        2. Have one cohort of students that has completed the entire curriculum of the professional degree program for which accreditation is sought. This class or cohort should expect to graduate in the spring with a subsequent fall visit for initial accreditation.

    ii. Programs that already have at least one NAAB-accredited professional degree program must have:

        1. No less than two years in continuous candidacy.

        2. A full term of accreditation[1] for the pre-existing accredited professional degree program in architecture.

        3. One graduating class that has completed the entire curriculum of the professional degree program for which accreditation is sought.

    iii. It is the responsibility of the program, not the NAAB, to inform students of the status of their degree program(s) relative to accreditation and whether the program is on schedule to achieve initial accreditation (see Condition II.4 and Appendix 1 of the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*).

b. **Request for Initial Accreditation.** Institutions seeking initial accreditation for a professional degree program in architecture that has been granted candidacy status must first notify the NAAB of their desire to be granted an initial term of accreditation.

    i. To initiate the process for achieving initial accreditation, the program must formally request that the NAAB schedule a visit for initial accreditation. The request is due not later than March 1 of the year prior to the year in which the visit for initial accreditation is requested.

---

[1] Programs seeking initial accreditation for a new program that already have an existing NAAB-accredited program must have a full term of accreditation; this term may be eight or six years depending on the year of the most recent visit for the pre-existing program.

      ii.   In making a request for initial accreditation, the program effectively forfeits any remaining time in the six-year candidacy. See Section 3.2 for more information.

     iii.   The request must include the following:

        1. A letter from the chief academic officer of the institution requesting a visit for initial accreditation of the professional degree program in architecture. The letter should include the specific degree name (e.g., B. Arch., M. Arch., or D. Arch.), including prerequisites (e.g., M. Arch. (preprofessional degree plus 60 graduate credits)).

        2. A copy of the most recent decision letter from the NAAB.

        3. A copy of the most recent decision letter from the recognized, U.S. regional accrediting agency for the institution (see *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation,* Part II: Section 2.1, Regional Accreditation).

        4. A brief assessment of the progress against the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation with specific attention to providing evidence that the plan will be fully implemented by the time of the site visit for initial accreditation.

        5. The request must be submitted in electronic format only.

           a. Requests are limited to 15 pages, including all supplemental information.

           b. The request is to be sent either in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF and is limited to 3 MBs.

        6. Applications are to be addressed to the Director, Accreditation, NAAB by email: info@naab.org with a copy to forum@naab.org. Please include "Application for Initial Accreditation Site Visit" and the name of the institution in the subject line.

c. **Initial Accreditation.** Once the application has been reviewed for completeness, the program will be added to the annual visit schedule for the next calendar year. Visits for initial accreditation are conducted in the fall only and are similar to those for continuing accreditation.

d. **Architecture Program Report for Initial Accreditation**

      i.   **Purpose.** The *Architecture Program Report for Initial Accreditation* (APR-IA) is similar to an APR for continuing accreditation. See Section 2.2, Report Formats.

      i.   **Review and Acceptance.** The process for review and acceptance is the same as for visits for continuing accreditation (see Section 5, Procedures for Continuing Accreditation).

      ii.   **Dates/Deadlines**

1. APR-IAs are due in the NAAB office by March 1 of the calendar year in which the initial accreditation visit is scheduled to take place.

2. New APR-IAs (if they are requested) are due not less than 45 days prior to the date for the visit.

   iii. **Dissemination of the APR-IA to the Public Prior to the Visit**. To stimulate broad-based participation, the program is encouraged to distribute the APR-IA within the school community before and during the site visit. However, the APR-IA is not to be shared with the general public until after the final decision is communicated by the NAAB (see Section 5.10).

e. **Visiting Teams**

   i. **Composition of Teams**

      1. Teams for visits for initial accreditation are composed in the same way as teams for continuing accreditation (see pp. 46-47).

   ii. **Team Chair**

      1. **Role.** See Section 2.3 General Information for a description of the role of the team chair.

      2. **Selection**. Visiting team chairs are selected in the same manner as those for teams for continuing accreditation.

   iii. **Non-Voting Member.** A non-voting team member is are permitted on a team visiting for initial accreditation. See Section 5, pp. 48-49, for additional information.

   iv. **Notification to Program**. The NAAB staff notifies the program administrator when a full team has been assembled. The program administrator is responsible for determining whether any member of the team poses a real or potential conflict of interest.

   v. **Conflicts of Interest**. The NAAB seeks to avoid any real or perceived conflicts of interest in its procedures, deliberations, and accrediting decisions. See Section 8, Conflicts of Interest for additional information.

   vi. **Challenges to Team Members**. Programs may challenge up to two members of a proposed visiting team, including the chair, under the terms of Section 8, Conflicts of Interest. Such challenges are to be made in writing within five calendar days of receiving notice of the nomination of a chair or the membership of a visiting team. Challenges will be reviewed by the NAAB executive director and the director, accreditation. Where challenges are permitted to stand, a new team member will be assigned. Challenges will not be accepted less than 21 days prior to the start of an accreditation visit.

f. **Site Visits**

   i. **Scheduling the Dates for the Visit**

1. The dates for a visit for initial accreditation are set by the team chair and the program administrator in consultation.

2. Generally, these visits take place between the first week of September and the last weekend of October each year.

3. Once a team has been assembled and proposed, the dates for a visit cannot be changed except under extreme circumstances.

4. Visits for initial accreditation begin on Saturday evening and end the following Wednesday at noon.

5. All members of the team are expected to participate in the visit the entire time.

6. If the program seeking initial accreditation is offered in more than one location, the team chair may be scheduled to arrive early in order to visit other locations for the program. These exceptions are agreed to by the team chair and the program administrator with advice from the NAAB staff. See Section 7, Special Circumstances for additional information on visits with special circumstances.

   ii. **Schedule/Agenda for the Visit.** The schedule for a visit for initial accreditation is the same as for continuing accreditation. See Section 5, Procedures for Continuing Accreditation for this information.

   iii. **Team Room.** The purpose, contents, access, standards, and equipment for a team room for a visit for initial accreditation are the same as for a visit for continuing accreditation. See Section 5 for this information.

   iv. **Optional Faculty Exhibits**. The program may provide evidence through a faculty exhibit[2] that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in the *Conditions for Accreditation*. If a program provides such an exhibit, it should only include highlights of faculty scholarly and professional development and achievement over the past five years or since the application for candidacy was submitted.

g. **Visiting Team Report (VTR).** See Section 2.2 for information about the *Visiting Team Report*.

   i. **Format**. The format for the VTR is the same as that for continuing accreditation (see Section 2.2).

   ii. **Confidential Recommendation**. The confidential recommendation is the same as that for continuing accreditation (see Section 2.2). This document is signed by all members of the team, except the non-voting member. (See Section 3.2 for the term of initial accreditation.) This

---

[2] The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent that 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.

document is confidential in perpetuity and non-binding on the Board. It must be transmitted not more than 30 days after the visit ends.

iii. **Review/Acceptance/Transmittal by the Team**. The team chair must transmit a final draft of the VTR to the NAAB office not later than 30 calendar days after the visit ends.

iv. **Review by NAAB Staff**. Upon receiving the draft from the team chair, the NAAB staff reviews the draft report and makes corrections for grammar, spelling, and punctuation. In addition, the report is reviewed for completeness and comprehension and to ensure that the team has not offered advice or recommendations for changes or modifications to the program. If there are concerns or requests for additional review, the draft is returned to the chair. Once the chair makes the adjustments to the draft, it is sent, without the confidential recommendation, to the program administrator.

v. **Corrections of Fact**. The program administrator is asked to review the draft VTR to make corrections of fact only. These corrections of fact are to be transmitted to the NAAB staff, who, in turn, may review the corrections with the team chair. The staff has 10 calendar days to accept or reject the corrections of fact and resubmit a final VTR.

vi. **Optional Response**. The final VTR is transmitted to the program administrator, who may choose to write a response.

vii. **Dates and Deadlines.** The NAAB strives to complete the review and preparation of all VTRs within 60 days of the end of a visit.

1. 30 days after the visit ends, the team chair sends the draft VTR and confidential recommendation to the NAAB staff.

2. The NAAB staff completes the initial edits and corrections, in consultation with the chair, and then sends the draft VTR to the program administrator.

3. Within 10 calendar days of receiving the draft VTR, the program submits corrections of fact. Corrections received after the deadline will not be accepted.

4. Within 10 calendar days of receiving the corrections of fact, the team chair accepts or rejects the corrections and submits the final VTR to the NAAB staff.

5. The NAAB staff transmits the final VTR to the program administrator for an optional response.

6. Within 10 calendar days of receiving the final VTR, the program sends its optional response to the NAAB office. Responses received after the deadline will not be forwarded to the Board.

7. Not later than 21 calendar days before the next meeting of the NAAB Board of Directors, the NAAB staff prepares the final report

dossier for Board review. This dossier contains these documents in the following order:

   a. Executive summary

   b. Final VTR

   c. Confidential recommendation

   d. Program response, if one is submitted

   e. All previous *Visiting Team Reports*

   f. Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation

   g. Eligibility memorandum

h. **Decision of the Board of Directors**. At the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting, the final report dossier is presented to the Board of Directors for a decision.

i. **Transmitting the Decision of the Board of Directors**. Within 14 calendar days of a Board decision regarding a term of initial accreditation, a letter announcing the decision is sent to the president of the institution, with copies to the program administrator, the team chair, and the team members. This letter is sent by overnight delivery. The institution has 14 calendar days from the receipt of a decision letter to request reconsideration (see Section 12, Reconsiderations).

j. **Confidentiality**. The team, including any non-voting member, must maintain strict confidentiality with respect to materials reviewed, interviews conducted, and team deliberations, including the team's recommendation on a term of initial accreditation, in perpetuity. The team bases its assessment of the program, in part, on interviews with various constituencies of the program. All individual and group interviews are confidential, and the information obtained from them is for the exclusive use of the team in preparing its report and recommendation.

k. Before the accreditation decision, both the NAAB and the program are prohibited from making either the APR-IA or the VTR available to the collateral organizations or the public.

l. **Public Disclosure of Accreditation Outcomes**

   i. After the accreditation decision, the program is required to disseminate the APR-IA, the final VTR and pertinent attachments, the current editions of the *Conditions* and the *Procedures* and any addenda, and, eventually, the *Interim Progress Report* and the NAAB response to the *Interim Progress Report*. These documents must be housed together and be freely accessible to all; this may be accomplished by publishing online.

   ii. Unless written permission is obtained from the NAAB, the program may disseminate only complete copies of the *Conditions* and the *Procedures* and any addenda and the VTR.

iii.   The program is required to inform faculty and incoming students that the current Student Performance Criteria and any addenda may be read on, or downloaded from, the NAAB website.

iv.   The NAAB publishes all VTRs at www.naab.org after accreditation decisions are made. These will be published without the confidential recommendation of the team.

v.   The accreditation decisions for a given year are published in the NAAB's *Annual Report.* In addition, they are made available to the collateral organizations and the public, and to other organizations upon request.

vi.   Within 30 calendar days of a decision to deny initial accreditation, the NAAB will notify the collateral organizations and the appropriate regional accrediting agency.

6.   **First Term of Continuing Accreditation Following Initial Accreditation.** Programs that achieve a three-year term of initial accreditation must receive an eight-year term of accreditation as a result of the Board's decision following the first visit for continuing accreditation, or accreditation may be revoked.

The team for a first visit for continuing accreditation subsequent to a term of initial accreditation will be composed of experienced team members and, to the extent possible, may include a former NAAB director.

SECTION 5. PROCEDURES FOR CONTINUING ACCREDITATION

Today, the NAAB's system for accreditation of professional degree programs within institutions requires a self-assessment by the accredited degree program, an evaluation of that assessment by the NAAB, and a site visit by a NAAB team that concludes with a recommendation to the NAAB as to the term of accreditation. The decision regarding the term of accreditation is made by the NAAB directors.

For programs that have achieved an initial accreditation or are seeking continuing accreditation of their NAAB-accredited degree programs, the sequence is essentially the same.

- The program submits an *Architecture Program Report*.

- The NAAB assigns a visiting team and a visit is conducted.

- The visiting team prepares a report and makes a confidential recommendation to the NAAB Board.

- The Board makes the final decision.

Once the Board has made a decision regarding a term of accreditation, continuing accreditation is subject to the submission of *Annual Statistical Reports* (see Section 9, Annual Statistical Reports) and an *Interim Progress Report* (see Section 10, Interim Progress Reports).

1. **Architecture Program Report**

    a. **Purpose**. The *Architecture Program Report* (APR) serves both as a self-study for the program and as the principal source document for conducting the visit.

    b. **Content**. The APR is, largely, a narrative document that is comprehensive and self-analytical. Instructions for preparing APRs are published separately from this document. Programs are required to use the templates provided by the NAAB for preparing APRs and related supplemental information. See www.naab.org for more information.

    c. **Review and Acceptance of the APR**.

        i. The APR is first reviewed by the NAAB staff to ensure that it is complete.

        ii. The APR is then reviewed by the team chair for completeness and clarity, to discern the complexity of the program's structure, and to identify issues that affect the size of the team or length and locales of the site visit. The visiting team chair's review results in a recommendation to the staff to do one of the following:

        iii. Accept the APR, and schedule the site visit.

        iv. Accept the APR, schedule the site visit, and request additional information before the visit.

        v. Require additional information to be submitted by November 15, and schedule the site visit after the additional information is received, reviewed, and determined to be acceptable.

vi. Reject the APR *and* require a new report to be submitted for review by November 15. If the new APR is considered acceptable, the visit will be scheduled.

vii. Should the chair recommend that the APR be rejected, the APR and the chair's review are brought before the NAAB Board of Directors for review and action.

viii. Should the school fail to deliver an acceptable amended or replacement APR by November 15, the chief academic officer of the institution is notified that the site visit cannot proceed and that accreditation may lapse.

d. **Dates/Deadlines**

i. APRs must be uploaded on or before September 7 of the calendar year immediately preceding the year in which accreditation is scheduled to expire (e.g., for visits scheduled in spring 2016, the APR is due September 7, 2015).

ii. Review of APRs must be completed before the regularly scheduled fall meeting of the NAAB Board of Directors.

iii. If a complete revision of the APR is requested by the team chair (see below), the revised APR is due November 15.

e. **Dissemination of the APR to the Public Prior to the Visit.** To stimulate broad-based participation, the program is encouraged to distribute the APR within the school community before and during the site visit. However, the APR is not to be shared with the general public until after the final decision is communicated by the NAAB.

2. **Visiting Teams**

a. **Composition of Teams**

For 2016 Visits Only	Under Consideration Beginning in 2017
For visits conducted in 2016, teams will be composed of at least four individuals, each of whom represents one of the four constituent organizations of the NAAB: the AIA, AIAS, ACSA, and NCARB.	Teams will be composed of three individuals: one educator, one practitioner, and one student.
In 2016, the NAAB will continue to evaluate the use of three-person teams on visits for continuing accreditation and whether the duration of visits can be reduced. A final decision on these two matters will be made by the NAAB based on an evaluation of pilot visits conducted in 2015 and 2016. A	

final decision on this item can be expected in July 2016.	

i. Team composition (See table above).

ii. One member of the team will be nominated by the NAAB executive committee to serve as the team chair.

iii. Teams are composed by the NAAB staff after the date for the visit has been set by the team chair and the program administrator.

iv. The NAAB seeks to ensure that the team is balanced regarding geography, gender, race/ethnicity, and accreditation experience. In addition, the staff makes every effort to ensure that no one proposed as a member of a visiting team has a real or perceived conflict of interest as defined in Section 8.

v. Every effort is made to assemble teams in such a way as to ensure that no more than one person, excluding the student, is on his/her first visit. This is not always possible.

vi. Team members are advised of their preliminary selection for a specific visit with the understanding that final approval of the team is the responsibility of the program.

vii. Except as set forth below, no individual shall be assigned more than once to serve as a member of a visiting team for the same program. This provision shall also apply to non-voting members on a visiting team.

viii. If a program received less than the maximum term of accreditation during its last accreditation cycle, then, with the express agreement of the program, one member of the last visiting team, exclusive of the non-voting member, may be assigned to the subsequent visiting team.

b. **Team Chair**

i. **Role**. The role of the team chair is described in Section 2.3.

ii. **Selection**. Visiting team chairs are nominated by the NAAB executive committee before the site visit. The selection is based on a review of the resumes of former visiting team chairs and experienced visiting team members, as well as an evaluation of their performance on previous visits and the quality of previous VTRs. NAAB staff notify program administrators once a chair has been nominated. An administrator may challenge the nomination for potential conflicts of interest (see Section 8). Once a chair has been confirmed, the administrator and the chair work together to select a date for the visit.

a. **Non-Voting Member**

iii. **Role**. To add useful perspective to the accreditation review process, the program is permitted to nominate one non-voting member to the visiting team.

iv. **Nomination and Approval**

1. The program administrator may nominate one non-voting member.

2. The nomination must be sent to the director, accreditation. The nomination must be accompanied by a resume or curriculum vitae and a brief description of the relationship between the individual and the program.

3. The non-voting team member will be approved by the director, accreditation or the executive director in consultation with the visiting team chair.

4. A non-voting team member cannot be proposed less than 21 days before the start of a visit.

5. A non-voting team member may be an educator, a practitioner, a member of the architecture community, or an alumnus/a who is able to offer insight into the program's unique qualities or history.

6. The following may not participate as a non-voting team member:

    a. Individuals who have graduated since the previous site visit. They are considered *per se* to have a real conflict of interest and may not participate in a visiting team in any capacity.

    b. Any individual who had or has a contractual or consulting relationship to the program at any time, whether paid or voluntary

    c. Any individual who previously visited the program as a member of a NAAB visiting team.

7. In order to avoid real or perceived conflicts of interest, programs are prohibited from compensating a non-voting team member other than reimbursing him/her for expenses directly related to participating in the visit.

8. A non-voting team member may only be nominated after a program has approved the membership of the official visiting team.

9. No person may serve as a non-voting team member for any visit more than once in any three-year period.

10. Any non-voting team member must read the *NAAB Conditions* and *Procedures*, read the APR, and complete an online training program before the visit begins.

11. A non-voting team member who fails to comply with the expectations or responsibilities of participating in a NAAB visit may be dismissed by the visiting team chair prior to the end of the visit. In the event that a non-voting team member is dismissed from the team, the team chair shall notify the program administrator and the NAAB executive director.

12. Occasionally, for training purposes, the NAAB may ask the program and the team chair to accept a special, additional, non-voting member. These individuals may be NAAB directors or NAAB staff members who have never experienced a visit.

The NAAB may refer other pre-approved individuals requesting opportunities to serve as non-voting team members directly to programs. These may include administrators from programs seeking candidacy or initial accreditation, foreign visitors, representatives of affiliated accrediting agencies, and volunteer leaders or staff from collateral organizations. Invitations to these individuals to serve on visiting teams must be made by the program administrator and approved by the team chair.

Programs that agree to include a NAAB-requested or NAAB-referred individual as a non-voting team member may nominate an additional non-voting team member.

v. **Participation**

1. The non-voting member must participate throughout the entire site visit. They are expected to assume the responsibilities expected from team members, participate in the activities of the team, and undertake tasks assigned by the team chair.

2. The non-voting member does not participate in the team's deliberations over the recommendation regarding the term of accreditation.

3. The non-voting member may be present at the last team work session solely at the discretion of the visiting team chair.

4. All non-voting members must agree in advance to abide by the principles of confidentiality as outlined in the *NAAB Procedures* and by the conflict of interest policies in Section 8, Conflicts of Interest.

c. **Notification to Program**. The NAAB staff notifies the program administrator when a full team has been assembled. The program administrator is responsible for determining whether any member of the team poses a real or potential conflict of interest.

i. **Conflicts of Interest**. The NAAB seeks to avoid any real or perceived conflict of interest in its procedures, deliberations, and accrediting decisions. See Section 8, Conflicts of Interest for additional information.

ii. **Challenges to Team Members**. Programs may challenge no more than two members of a proposed visiting team, including the chair, under the terms of Section 8, Conflicts of Interest. Such challenges are to be made in writing within five calendar days of receiving notice of the nomination of a team chair or the membership of a visiting team. Challenges will be reviewed by the NAAB executive director and the director, accreditation. When challenges are permitted to stand, a new team member will be assigned. Challenges will not be accepted less than 21 days prior to the start of an accreditation visit.

3. **Site Visits**

   a. **Scheduling the Dates for the Visit**

      i. The dates for a visit for continuing accreditation are set by the team chair in consultation with the program administrator.

      ii. Generally, these visits take place between the last week of January and the first week of April each year.

      iii. Visits for continuing accreditation begin on Saturday evening and end the following Wednesday at noon.

      iv. All members of the team are expected to participate in the visit the entire time.

      v. Additional days may be added to the visit if the program is offered in more than one location; likewise, individual members of the team may be scheduled to participate on additional days to visit other locations for the program. These exceptions are agreed to in advance by the team chair and the program administrator with advice from the NAAB staff. See Section 7, Special Circumstances, for additional information on visits with special circumstances.

      vi. Dates for visits cannot be changed once a team has been assembled and proposed to the program except under extreme circumstances. See Section 7 for additional information.

   b. **Schedule/Agenda for Each Visit**. Each visit must include, at a minimum, the following:

      i. **Prior to the Visit**

         1. **Team Conference Call #1**. Team members, including the non-voting member participate in a mandatory pre-visit conference call. During the call, the visiting team reviews the APR*,* the *Conditions*, and the *Procedures*, discusses visit protocols, and establishes expectations for how the team will work. Travel plans (arrivals/departures, hotel information, ground transportation) are also reviewed at this time. Team members discuss their initial reactions to the APR, raise any initial concerns, and identify and prioritize the questions to be addressed during the documentary review (see below) and, later, during the visit. This call will take place 30 days prior to the start of the visit.

         2. **Team Conference Call #2**. Team members, including the non-voting member, participate in a second, mandatory pre-visit conference call to review the results of the documentary review (see below), identify missing materials or documents, prepare questions to be addressed during the visit, and identify any other areas of inquiry. At this time, the visiting team chair outlines team assignments and may revise details of the agenda. This call will take place 14 days before the visit.

3. **Attend Team Member Training**. All team members are required to complete the NAAB Team Member Training program prior to the visit.

4. **Documentary Review**. This is a review of reports, tables, and other documentary material prepared and presented in support of the program's compliance with the following *Conditions:*

   a. Administrative Structure

   b. Governance

   c. Social Equity

   d. Learning Culture

   e. Long-Range Planning

   f. Assessment

   g. Human Resources and Human Resource Development

   h. Financial Resources (to the extent possible)[3]

   i. Information Resources

   j. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

   k. Public Information

   l. *Annual Statistical Reports*

   m. *Interim Progress Reports*

   This material is to be presented either in PDFs or other online formats and made available to the team not less than 30 days prior to the visit.

ii. **Onsite**

1. **Tours**

   a. **Physical Resources.** The school conducts a brief tour of the physical resources that support the professional degree program.

   b. **Team Room.** This tour should include an explanation of how the team room is organized

   c. **Library/Information Resources**. The library tour includes a meeting with the architecture librarian and visual resources professional to discuss their assessment of those components.

2. **Meetings.** NOTE: All meetings are confidential, informal discussions, **not** presentations.

---

[3] The program administrator and the team chair will agree on matters of content and format for financial information. Team members are reminded that financial information may be considered sensitive and confidential by the program or the institution. This is especially true for private institutions.

a. **Staff**. This is a meeting with key staff of the academic unit without any faculty or administrators present. Staff that attend this meeting should include, but not be limited to, administrative assistants, shop personnel, librarians, career placement professionals, advisors, and others.

b. **Program Head**. These meetings include a discussion of issues arising from the APR, the program's strategic plan and self-assessment procedures, progress made since the previous site visit, any required changes to the visit agenda, and any requests for additional materials that the team may need. These meetings are often held daily.

c. **Meetings with the School or College Administrator, Faculty, and Students**. These are separate meetings and allow comparison of the views held by each constituency on the program's strengths and causes for concern or any issue raised by the visiting team, the program, or the institution.

    i. Meetings with faculty must be open to all ranks from the various curricular areas, including those from other disciplines supporting the program.

    ii. Meetings with students, without the presence of any administrators, staff, or faculty, should be arranged so that all students can attend.

d. **Meeting with Student Representatives**. This is an informal gathering of a small group of student leaders, without the presence of any administrators, staff, or faculty. The students may be officers in student organizations or elected to attend by their peers.

e. **Optional Meeting with Graduates and Local Practitioners**. This meeting is optional. Attendees may include graduates of the program, employers, local registration board members, and representatives of the local AIA chapter.

f. **Review of Student Work**. Team members are individually and jointly responsible for assessing student work.

g. **Observation of Studios, Lectures, and Seminars**. The team may divide to attend scheduled classes or use evenings to observe unscheduled studio activity.

h. **Review of Student Records and Transfer Credit Assessment**. These are files to be reviewed as part of the team's assessment of Condition II.3. They should be presented in compliance with FERPA.

i. **Debriefing Sessions**. The team meets daily to evaluate its progress, adjust assignments, and assess the need for additional information.

j. **Team Deliberations and Drafting the VTR**. The last two work sessions of the site visit are set aside for the team to deliberate on the outcomes of the visit, determine its recommendation, and draft the VTR. By the end of the last work session, the VTR should be in a draft form and ready for editing by the visiting team chair.

k. **Exit Interviews**. The sequence of exit interviews is prescribed in order to ensure that the team delivers its initial information to key leaders within the institution and the program before addressing the faculty, staff, and students in the program. These interviews are not to take place until the team has finished its deliberations. The purpose of these interviews is to communicate the following:

 i. The conditions met with distinction

 ii. The conditions not met

 iii. Any general team comments or acknowledgements

These interviews are led by the chair; other members of the team may be called upon by the chair to comment. All members of the team are advised to avoid making any comments that may be interpreted as offering advice or other recommendations to the program or as revealing the content of the confidential recommendation.

The recommended sequence of exit interviews is as follows:

 i. Exit interview with the program administrator, one hour. Questions and answers of clarification are permitted; the team chair will lead any response.

 ii. Exit interview with the leadership of the academic unit in which the program is located (e.g., director, chair, dean), 30 minutes. Questions and answers of clarification are permitted; the team chair will lead any response.

 iii. Exit interview with the central administrators responsible for oversight of the academic unit in which the program is located (e.g., provost or vice president for academic affairs), 30 minutes. Questions and answers of clarification are permitted; the team chair will lead any response.

 iv. Exit interview with the students, faculty, and staff of the program, 30 minutes; questions and answers are not permitted.

The team is required to leave the institution as soon as the last interview is completed.

c. **Team Room**

   i. **Purpose**. The team room is a securable, reasonably soundproof room accessible only to the team, which is, to the extent possible, located in the same building as the program. It is for the exclusive use of the team.

   ii. **Standards for Visit Preparation**. The process of preparation for an accreditation visit—drafting documents, collecting and displaying student work, documenting student achievement and outcomes, and installing prepared materials in the team room and beyond—shall be accomplished by the program in accordance with its studio culture policy.

   iii. **Contents**. Before the site visit, the program head and visiting team chair discuss the content and organization of the team room. The room must contain fully labeled and easily accessible samples of student work. Exhibits must include examples of both the minimum passing assessment and high achievement; be of sufficient quantity to demonstrate that all graduates are meeting the performance criteria; have been executed since the previous site visit; and span no less than two previous academic years. In all cases, student work should be presented in the form in which it was evaluated by the instructor. If work was reviewed in electronic format, the program is expected to provide the applications used to create the work in order for the team to review it. The team room must contain the following:

      1. **Student Studio Work**. The graphic or visual material must be presented in a format that is easily sorted and reviewed. The studio work must represent the full range of approaches taken and assignments made by various faculty. In addition to final projects, in-progress work (e.g., drawings, models, related assignments, and student journals) may be included.

         While a range of work must be displayed for each required course, it is not necessary to present the complete output of a studio, lecture, or seminar.

         The organization of student work is left to the discretion of the program in consultation with the team chair, but each piece must cross-reference the course matrix and the criteria it addresses, be dated, and indicate its assessment from minimum passing assessment to high achievement. Ideally, examples by several different students or teams should be furnished.

      2. **Course Notebooks**. A notebook must be provided for each required and elective course (i.e., optional studies, see *2014 Conditions for Accreditation*), including studio courses. The notebook for required courses must contain syllabi, project statements or assignments, handouts, bibliographies, weekly activities, quizzes and examinations, where applicable, and

corresponding samples of student work. The notebook must also contain a statistical summary of achievement by all students in the course. The notebook for optional studies courses should contain syllabi and any other material that the program deems important.

The notebooks may be presented in digital format or hard copy format. If they are in digital format, they should be presented either as PDFs on a shared drive or digital platform (e.g., Google Docs or Dropbox), or as an interactive site. The program must provide usernames and passwords to the team, if needed, to access the files.

3. **Student Admissions and Advising Files.** These are copies of files for students admitted to the program, with identifying information removed, that demonstrate the process by which students are admitted to the program and how, if appropriate, advanced standing is determined (see *2014 Conditions for Accreditation*, Part II: Section 3).

4. **Team Work Area**. The room must contain a conference table, with enough seating to accommodate the entire team.

5. **Access**. The team room must be secure; the only keys are to be given to the members of the team. No one other than the team is to be in the room, except at the team chair's invitation.

6. **Equipment**. The room must contain the following: a document shredder, viewing/projection equipment as requested by the visiting team chair, Internet access, a printer, an LCD projector, and a sufficient number of electrical outlets and types of outlets.

7. **Visit Agenda and Resumes**. The visit agenda and resumes of the team should be posted near the team room for public review.

8. **Faculty Photos**. Faculty photos should be made available to the team either in hard copy or electronically.

9. **Matrices**
   a. A large copy of the faculty credentials matrix for the current semester, as described in Part I: Section 2, should be posted in the team room.
   b. A large copy of the SPC matrix, described in Part II: Section 1, Student Performance Criteria, *2014 Conditions for Accreditation*, should be posted in the team room.

10. **Additional Instructions**
   a. Dual Programs and Additional Teaching Sites. If work from more than one professional degree program or track, or from additional teaching sites is being reviewed, student work from each program or track, or site must be clearly identified. While a range of work must be displayed for

each required course, it is not necessary to present the complete output of a studio, lecture, or seminar.

   b. Assignments. Class assignments must be available for all projects presented. As the team will need to gain an overview of the curriculum and the integration of studio and coursework during each year of the program, it may be helpful to organize a single year's documentation in one area.

   c. Displays Outside the Team Room. Exhibits in spaces outside the team room can augment, but not substitute for, team room exhibits. They should be identified in a manner consistent with team room displays, except that indications of minimum passing assessment to high achievement should be omitted in public displays.

d. **Optional Faculty Exhibit**. The program may provide evidence through a faculty exhibit[4] that the faculty, taken as a whole, reflects the range of knowledge and experience necessary to promote student achievement as described in Part II of the *2014 Conditions for Accreditation*. If included in the program's preparation for the visit, this exhibit should include highlights of faculty professional scholarship and professional development and achievement since the last accreditation visit.

4. **Visiting Team Report (VTR)**

   a. See Section 2.2 for the content and format of the VTR.

   b. **Review/Acceptance/Transmittal by the Team**. The team chair must transmit a final draft of the VTR to the NAAB office not later than 30 calendar days after the visit ends.

   c. **Review by NAAB Staff**. Upon receiving the draft report from the team chair, the NAAB staff reviews it and makes corrections for grammar, spelling, and punctuation. In addition, the report is reviewed for completeness and comprehension and to ensure that the team has not offered advice or recommendations for changes or modifications to the program. If there are concerns or requests for additional review, the draft is returned to the chair. Once the chair makes the adjustments to the draft, it is sent, without the confidential recommendation, to the program administrator.

   d. **Corrections of Fact**. The program administrator is asked to review the draft VTR to make corrections of fact only. These corrections of fact are to be transmitted to the NAAB staff, who will review the corrections with the team chair. The team chair has 10 calendar days to accept or reject the corrections of fact and resubmit a final VTR.

   In the event that a team has assessed an SPC as not met for a second, consecutive visit, the program is required to provide a response to the team's assessment when it submits its corrections of fact.

---

[4] The faculty exhibit should be set up near or in the team room. To the extent that 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.

e. **Optional Response**. The final VTR is transmitted to the program administrator, who may choose to write a response.

5. **Confidential Recommendation**. In a separate document, the team transmits a recommendation on the term of accreditation to the NAAB Board of Directors, which is signed by all members of the team, <u>except</u> the non-voting member(s) (see Section 3, Terms of Accreditation, for terms that may be recommended). The content of this document remains confidential in perpetuity. The recommendation is non-binding on the Board. This document is to be transmitted separately from the VTR not later than 30 calendar days after the visit ends.

6. **Dates and Deadlines**

    a. Every effort is made to make VTRs available for review by the NAAB directors 60 days after a visit ends.

        i. Within 30 days of the last day of the visit, the team chair sends the draft VTR and confidential recommendation to the NAAB staff.

        ii. The NAAB staff completes the initial edits and corrections in consultation with the chair and sends the draft VTR to the program administrator.

        iii. Within 10 calendar days of receiving the draft VTR, the program submits corrections of fact. Corrections sent after the deadline will not be accepted.

        iv. Within 10 calendar days of receiving the corrections of fact, the NAAB staff and team chair accept or reject the corrections and complete the final VTR.

        v. The NAAB staff transmits the final VTR to the program administrator for an optional response.

        vi. Within 10 calendar days of receiving the final VTR, the program sends its optional response to the NAAB office. Responses sent after the deadline will not be forwarded to the Board.

    b. Not later than 21 calendar days before the next meeting of the NAAB Board of Directors, the NAAB staff prepares the final report dossier for the directors' review. This dossier contains four separate documents. They are:

        i. Executive summary

        ii. Final VTR

        iii. Confidential recommendation

        iv. Program response, if one is submitted

        v. All previously submitted *Interim Progress Reports* (see Section 10, Interim Progress Reports)

7. **Decision of the Board of Directors**. At the Board's next regularly scheduled meeting, the final report dossier is presented to the Board of Directors for a decision.

8. **Transmitting the Decision of the Board of Directors**. Within 14 calendar days of a Board decision regarding a term of accreditation, a letter announcing the decision is sent to the president of the institution, with copies to the program administrator, the team chair, and the

team members. This letter is sent by overnight delivery. In the event that the Board decides to revoke accreditation, the letter will include the reasons for the decision and advice for addressing the deficiencies before applying for reinstatement (see Section 7, Special Circumstances). The institution has 14 calendar days from the receipt of a decision letter to request reconsideration (see Section 12. Reconsiderations).

9. **Confidentiality**. The team, including the non-voting member, must maintain strict confidentiality with respect to materials reviewed, interviews conducted, and team deliberations, including the team's recommendation on a term of accreditation in perpetuity. The team bases its assessment of the program, in part, on interviews with various constituencies of the program. All individual and group interviews are confidential, and the information obtained from them is for the exclusive use of the team in preparing its report and recommendation.

Before the accreditation decision, both the NAAB and the program are prohibited from making either the APR or the VTR available to the collateral organizations or the public.

10. **Public Disclosure of Accreditation Outcomes**

    a. After the accreditation decision, the program is required to disseminate the APR, the final VTR and pertinent attachments (including the program response, if one was prepared), the current editions of the *Conditions* and the *Procedures* and any addenda, and, eventually, the *Interim Progress Report(s)* and the NAAB decision letter(s) for *Interim Progress Report(s)*. These documents must be housed together on the program's website and be freely accessible to all.

    b. Unless written permission is obtained from the NAAB, the program may disseminate only complete copies of the APR, the VTR, and the *Conditions* and the *Procedures* and any addenda. Programs may not publish these documents in abbreviated or excerpted forms.

    c. The program is required to provide faculty and students with access to the current Student Performance Criteria and related accreditation documents (see *2014 Conditions for Accreditation,* Part II: Section 4, Public Information*).*

    d. The NAAB publishes all VTRs after accreditation decisions are made at www.naab.org. These will be published without the confidential recommendation of the team.

    e. The accreditation decisions for a given year are published in the NAAB's *Annual Report.* In addition, they are made available to the collateral organizations and the public, and to other organizations upon request.

    f. Within 30 calendar days of a decision to revoke accreditation, the NAAB will notify the collateral organizations, the appropriate regional accrediting agency, and the licensing board for the jurisdiction in which the institution is located.

11. **Special Provisions for Institutions with More than One NAAB-Accredited Degree Program**. If an institution offers more than one NAAB-accredited degree program, certain adjustments may be made to the schedule, team, and APR.

    a. **Adjustments to the Schedule**. To the extent possible, the NAAB prefers to schedule a concurrent review of all NAAB-accredited programs in a single visit.

Thus, any institution that offers more than one NAAB-accredited program would be expected to prepare one APR and one team room, and host one team. At the discretion of the team chair and in consultation with the program administrator(s), the visit may be extended by one day to facilitate review of student work.

b. **Adjustments to the Team**. Any team scheduled for concurrent review for continuing accreditation of more than one NAAB-accredited program at the same institution will have one additional team member. The presence of this additional team member will not affect the ability of the program to nominate a non-voting member.

c. **Adjustment to the APR**

    i. Part I: Institutional Support and Commitment to Continuous Improvement

        1. Part I: Section 1. The APR may provide one response for all accredited degree programs.

        2. Part I: Section 2. The APR must provide information indicating that there are appropriate resources for each NAAB-accredited program.

    ii. Part II: Educational Outcomes and Curriculum

        1. Part II: Section 1. The program must provide a separate matrix for each degree program offered and for each track for completion of the accredited degree(s).

        2. Part II: Section 2. The program must provide complete information regarding the curriculum for each of the NAAB-accredited programs and for all tracks for completion of the NAAB-accredited degree(s).

        3. Part II: Section 3. The program must demonstrate the processes for the analysis and evaluation of the preparatory education of students admitted to any of its accredited degree programs, with special attention paid to evaluating whether SPC are expected to have been met in educational experiences in non-accredited programs.

        4. Part II: Section 4. The program may provide one response for all NAAB-accredited programs.

        5. Part III: The program must demonstrate that all NAAB-accredited programs are in compliance with Conditions III.1 and III.2.

d. **Special Provisions for Institutions Seeking Candidacy or Initial Accreditation at the Same Time as a Visit for Continuing Accreditation**

In the rare case that an institution is seeking candidacy or initial accreditation for an additional NAAB-accredited professional degree program in architecture in the same year as a visit for continuing accreditation, the visits will not be combined. Instead, separate visits will be scheduled with separate teams. In addition, a separate APR must be prepared for each program to be visited.

SECTION 6. SUBSTANTIVE CHANGES REQUIRING REVIEW BY THE NAAB

Occasionally, programs or institutions may seek to make substantive changes that may affect the NAAB-accredited degree program.

These changes may include making a curricular change that does not require a change of degree title, the consolidation or merging of institutions that offer a NAAB-accredited program, the addition of tracks for completion of the NAAB-accredited degree, or a change in the title(s) of the NAAB-accredited degree program offered (e.g., B. Arch. to M. Arch.).

Substantive changes that must be reviewed by the NAAB, prior to implementation by the program or institution, include the following:

- Professional degrees and curriculum changes:
    - Changes to the curriculum of an existing program or track for completing the program that affects the admissions requirements of the program (e.g., shifting from a single-institution M. Arch. to an M. Arch. that requires a preprofessional undergraduate degree for admission).
    - Changes to the curriculum that effectively "split" an accredited single-institution program into a multi-degree sequence that concludes with an accredited graduate degree and that may require an undergraduate degree for admission (e.g., changing from a B. Arch. to an M. Arch. that requires a preprofessional degree for admission).
    - A program change that requires a significant change in pedagogy or the approach to delivering the professional degree (e.g., moving from traditional, on-campus learning to fully online learning).
- Nomenclature change proposals are limited to the following:
    - Programs seeking to convert an existing B. Arch. program already in excess of 150 credits into a single-institution M. Arch. program through modest adjustments in the curriculum in order to achieve the 168-credit minimum.
    - Programs seeking to convert an existing five-year, single-institution M. Arch program into a B. Arch. program through modest adjustments in the curriculum in order to achieve the 150-credit minimum.
    - Programs seeking to convert an existing M. Arch. program that requires an undergraduate degree (either in architecture or another discipline) for admission into a D. Arch. program through modest adjustments in the curriculum in order to achieve the 210-credit minimum.
- Institutional changes:
    - Changes to the institution that offers the accredited degree program. These include consolidation or merging with another institution.
    - Physical relocation of a program within a single institution, with multiple, additional teaching sites or remote sites (e.g., an institution consolidating the professional program at an additional teaching site or from multiple sites to a single location).

- The addition of new tracks to existing accredited programs.

- Phasing out an existing NAAB-accredited program.

Any program seeking to make a substantive change must first consult the NAAB to determine which of the following procedures is appropriate or whether the changes are sufficiently expansive to constitute a new, proposed program that may be required to pursue candidacy and initial accreditation. In the event that the program must pursue candidacy and initial accreditation, the Board may approve an accelerated schedule.

Generally, review and approval of substantive changes follow this sequence:

- Letter of application to the NAAB

- Submission of a proposal or description of the change

- Review of the application and additional material

- Decision by the NAAB directors

If approved, substantive changes may not be applied retroactively.

1. **Substantive Changes**

    a. **Application.** Programs seeking approval of a substantive change must submit the following to the NAAB Board of Directors:

        i. A letter from the chief academic officer of the institution requesting approval of the change.

        ii. A copy of the most recent decision letter from the NAAB.

        iii. Copies of other institutional or state-required approvals for the change. The NAAB will not consider substantive change requests that have not met all other requirements for institutional or state-required approvals.

        iv. Implementation Plan. This plan must identify a course of action for implementation of the substantive change within not more than two academic years after receiving approval from the NAAB. The plan must include the following:

            a. Securing resources not already available to the program (e.g., faculty, space, financial support), if necessary.

            b. Developing and implementing new courses and/or curricular sequences, if necessary.

            c. Proposed last academic year in which students will be admitted to the program in its current configuration.

            d. Plans for ensuring that students in the existing configuration are able to complete the program on time.

            e. Proposed first academic year in which students may enroll in the new program configuration.

  f. Proposed academic year in which the first cohort of students will complete the newly configured program.

  g. A plan for communicating with current students, newly admitted students, faculty, staff, alumni, and the state registration/licensing board if the program change is approved by the NAAB. NOTE: If approved, program changes may not be applied retroactively.

  h. A timeline showing all key dates for the institutional change, including, but not limited to:

   i. State-required approvals.

   ii. Regional accrediting agency-required approvals.

   iii. Effective dates:

    1. Last academic year in which students will be enrolled in the existing program or institutional configuration.

    2. First academic year in which students will be enrolled under the new program or institutional configuration.

    3. Last academic year in which students will graduate from the existing program or institutional configuration.

    4. First academic year in which students will graduate from the new program or institutional configuration.

 v. Documentation specific to the type of change proposed (see below).

 vi. Applications for substantive changes may be sent by email only and are to be addressed to the director, accreditation at the NAAB. They may be submitted at any time.

   1. Applications are limited to 50 pages and 2 MBs.

   2. They are to be in either Word or Adobe PDF.

   3. By email: info@naab.org with a copy to forum@naab.org. Please include "Application for Substantive Change – [Name of Institution]" in the subject line.

b. **Substantive Change Review Panel**

 i. The NAAB will assign a team of three persons: a current NAAB director, a member of the most recent visiting team, and one experienced team member or team chair (with the exception of the NAAB director, the panelists will be selected to ensure that one is an educator and the other, a practitioner).

 ii. One of the three will be designated by the NAAB directors as the panel chair.

 iii. There are no non-voting team members on panels to review substantive change requests.

c. **Responsibilities of the Panel Chair**

 i. Coordinate the review of documents with the other members of the team.

ii. Coordinate the initial assessment of the materials and make a recommendation to the NAAB staff as to whether a visit is required (see below).

iii. Communicate with the NAAB staff and the program on the details of the visit, if required.

iv. Prepare the final *Substantive Change Report*.

d. **Substantive Change Sequence**

i. The panel will review the application and materials together with the most recent VTR.

ii. The panel will confer, using any reasonable means, to determine whether the documentary evidence is sufficient for making a recommendation to the NAAB directors. The panel will reach an initial decision from among the following:

1. Based on a review of the documentary evidence, the panel determines that the program has provided sufficient evidence for making a recommendation to the NAAB Board of Directors and no visit is necessary.

2. Based on a review of the documentary evidence, the panel determines that the program must provide additional or supplemental materials before a recommendation can be made and no visit is necessary.

3. The panel determines, based on a review of all documentary evidence provided, that a visit is necessary to review additional evidence or to confer with program administrators and other institutional leaders.

iii. If the panel determines that no visit is necessary:

1. The panel chair requests the additional materials from the program, if necessary.

2. The panel may choose to consult with program or institutional administrators by conference call in order to ask questions and seek clarification.

3. Once the panel has assembled the necessary materials and agrees that it has sufficient evidence on which to base a recommendation, the panel chair will prepare a report using the *Substantive Change Report* template. The report must be confined to the analysis of the proposal and the program's preparation for implementing the change.

4. The NAAB will provide a copy of the report to the program to correct errors of fact or omissions.

5. The panel will prepare, as a separate document, a confidential recommendation to the Board, which is signed by all members of the panel. This document is confidential in perpetuity and is non-binding on the Board.

6. The final copy of the report, with the recommendation of the panel, will be sent to the NAAB Board for action at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

iv. If the panel determines that a visit is necessary:

1. The panel chair will consult with the program administrator to set a date for a one-day Substantive Change visit. Visits are to take place on a weekday when classes are in session and students are on campus.

2. The scope of the visit is limited to the preparation by the institution or academic unit for implementing the substantive change.

3. The panel chair and program administrator will consult on the schedule for the visit. Generally, visits should include the following:

   a. Entrance and exit meetings with the program administrator.

   b. Meetings with institutional administrators with responsibility for implementation of the change (e.g., department chair or dean).

   c. Meetings with faculty.

   d. Meetings with students.

   e. Review of documents and other evidence deemed appropriate by the program or requested by the panel chair to demonstrate the program's readiness to implement the change.

4. The program should be prepared to provide the reviewer with a secure work space for use during his/her time on campus.

5. Upon the conclusion of the visit, the panel chair will consult with the other members of the panel and prepare a report using the *Substantive Change Report* template.

6. The NAAB will provide a copy of the report to the program to correct errors of fact or omissions.

7. The final copy of the report, with the recommendation of the review panel, will be sent to the NAAB Board for action.

8. The program, if it wishes, may submit a written response to the final report when it submits corrections of fact.

e. **Recommendations for Substantive Change Proposals.** The panel may make one of three recommendations to the NAAB Board of Directors. NOTE: These do not apply to Phase-Out Plans (see pp. 67-68):

   i. Approve the change and leave the existing visit schedule unchanged.

   ii. Approve the change and advance the time for the next visit for continuing accreditation while allowing adequate time for the program to prepare.

   iii. Deny the change.

In the event that the change is approved, the panel will recommend a specific date by which the existing program will be fully phased out, including appropriate "teach out dates." In the event that the change results in a nomenclature change for the accredited degree, an effective date for the new degree title will be reported to NCARB.

f. **Final Decision**. The responsibility for the final decision rests with the NAAB directors.

    i. In the event that the substantive change request is denied, the program must wait until after its next regularly scheduled accreditation visit to reapply.

    ii. Decisions of the NAAB regarding substantive changes are not subject to reconsideration or appeal.

g. **Additional Materials Required for Substantive Change Proposals.** In addition to the items listed above (a.i-a.v), the following materials are required. These are specific to the type of change being proposed.

    i. Professional degree and curriculum change proposals must include the following:

        1. Description of the current degree program.

            a. This should be similar to the program's response to Condition II.2.2, Professional Degrees and Curriculum, in its most recent *Architecture Program Report*.[5]

            b. The matrix for Condition II.1, Student Performance Criteria, for the current degree program.

        2. Proposed new degree program or curriculum configuration.

            a. A description of the changes that will be made to the program while also ensuring that it conforms to NAAB and institutional requirements, including:

            b. A narrative that responds to the requirements of Condition II.2.2.

            c. A new matrix for Student Performance Criteria for the accredited program under its new configuration.

            d. Any prerequisites.

            e. Assessment of the effect of the proposed changes on Conditions I.2.1-I.2.5.

    ii. Merger or consolidation of institutions.

    NOTE: In the event that the merger or consolidation affects NAAB-accredited programs at both institutions, the NAAB may request additional material.

---

[5] Condition II.2.2 (*2014 Conditions*) is similar to II.2.1 from the *2009 Conditions*.

Under this circumstance, please consult with the NAAB early in the process to determine the scope and scale of the review.

1. A description of the current program using *2014 Conditions* I.1.

2. A description of the resources currently supporting the program (*2014 Conditions* I.2.1-I.2.5).

3. A description of the effect of the proposed change on the program's compliance with *2014 Conditions* I.2.1-I.2.5*.*

4. An assessment of the implications of the existing program for the following:

   a. Mission of the program (I.1)

   b. Learning Culture (I.2)

   c. Social Equity (I.3)

   d. Defining Perspectives (I.5)

   e. Long Range Planning (I.6)

   f. Self-Assessment (I.7)

   g. Resources (I.2)

   h. Enrollment

iii. New or additional tracks for completing a NAAB-accredited degree program.

1. Proposals for new or additional tracks for completing a NAAB-accredited degree program must include all of the same materials as for a professional degree and curriculum change (see above).

2. An assessment of the implications of the new track for the existing program.

iv. Nomenclature change.

1. Programs seeking approval of a nomenclature change request must have the following:

   a. A full term of continuing accreditation.

   b. Condition II.2 of the *2014* or *2009 Conditions for Accreditation,* Curricular Framework, must have been met as of the last accreditation visit and VTR.

   c. No element of Condition II.3 of the *2014* or *2009 Conditions for Accreditation* may be listed as a cause of concern in the most recent VTR.

   d. No more than four years have elapsed since the last regularly scheduled accreditation visit.

2. The proposal for the nomenclature change must include the following:

   a. Description of the current degree program that includes:

<ol type="i" start="1">
The program's response to Condition II.2.2, Professional Degrees and Curriculum, from the most recent *Architecture Program Report.*
The SPC matrix for Condition II.1 for the current degree program.

<ol type="a" start="2">
Proposed new degree nomenclature.
<ol type="i">
A description of any changes that must be made to the program in order to conform to NAAB and institutional requirements, including:
A new response to Condition II.2.2.
A new SPC matrix for the accredited program under its new title.
Any prerequisites.

2. **Phasing Out Programs**

An institution that intends to eliminate its NAAB-accredited degree must maintain compliance with the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* until the conclusion of the fiscal year in which the institution will cease awarding the accredited degree.

Any institution that intends to eliminate a NAAB-accredited degree must provide the following by June 30 of the year in which a decision to phase out a degree was made:

<ol type="a">
A letter from the chief academic officer of the institution requesting approval of the Phase-Out Plan and extension of the current term of accreditation to the teach-out date.
Copies of all correspondence with the appropriate state agencies and regional accrediting agencies regarding the decision to phase out the NAAB-accredited degree.
Implementation Plan. The plan must include the following:

Teach-out date for the program.[6] This is the date after which the university will no longer award the degree.
Summary of courses to be offered and faculty assigned during the phase-out, with a corresponding SPC matrix.
Summary of resources to be used to support students and faculty during the phase-out.
Last academic year in which students were admitted to the program in its current configuration.
Table showing the number of students currently enrolled and their projected dates for graduation.
Plans for ensuring that students currently enrolled in the NAAB-accredited degree program are able to complete the program by the teach-out date.

---

[6] The teach-out date will be reported to the National Council of Architectural Registrations. Degrees awarded after the teach-out date will not be considered NAAB-accredited.

7. Analysis of the number of students who may not complete the program by the teach-out date, and plans for advising them and ensuring that they can complete a NAAB-accredited degree.

8. A plan for communicating with students, faculty, staff, alumni, and the state registration/licensing board; copies of all communications with the above-listed groups.

9. Evidence that the program has publicly announced the phase-out of the program in all of its promotional materials, including websites.

d. **Action on Phase-Out Plans.** Phase-Out Plans will be reviewed by the full Board. The Board may take one of two actions; these depend on the proximity of the teach-out date to the date of the next visit:

1. If the teach-out date is less than two years from the date of the next visit, the Board can approve the Phase-Out Plan and extend the term of accreditation to the teach-out date.

2. If the teach-out date is more than two years from the date of the next visit, the Board can approve the Phase-Out Plan and leave the date of the next visit in place.

During a phase-out period, students enrolled in the accredited degree program must be able to complete their entire course of study, with the necessary resources, as accredited by the NAAB. Further, regularly scheduled visits for continuing accreditation will take place.

Any program that phases out a program without first filing a plan for phasing out the NAAB-accredited degree will be considered to have forfeited accreditation of the professional degree in architecture, and accreditation will be revoked. The effective date of revocation will be December 31 of the year in which the institution began the phase-out of the program. Program and institution administrators are strongly encouraged to contact the NAAB before beginning any phase-out process.

3. **Confidentiality**

Panels must maintain strict confidentiality with respect to materials reviewed, interviews conducted, and panel deliberations, including the panel's recommendation on a substantive change request in perpetuity. The panel bases its assessment of the request, in part, on interviews with various constituencies of the program. All individual and group interviews are confidential, and the information obtained from them is for the exclusive use of the panel in preparing its report and recommendation.

Before the decision, both the NAAB and the program are prohibited from making the application, proposal, or final report available to the collateral organizations or the public.

SECTION 7. SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES

1. **Request for Postponement of a Regularly Scheduled Visit**

   Under certain circumstances, a program may request postponement of a regularly scheduled visit for continuing accreditation, initial candidacy, or continuation of candidacy. The process for requesting a postponement is the same in all cases. A program may only request a postponement one time in any accreditation cycle.

   The following may not be postponed: visits for initial accreditation, substantive change reviews, and nomenclature change reviews.

   a. **Procedure for Requesting a Postponement.** Not later than July 1 of the year prior to a regularly scheduled visit for continuing accreditation or continuation of candidacy, a program may request that the visit be postponed to the next academic semester or quarter (e.g., a visit scheduled for spring 2016 may be postponed to fall 2016). The request must include the following:

      i. A written request for the postponement from the institution's chief academic officer.

      ii. A brief description of the reason(s) for requesting the postponement.

      iii. A brief description of the benefit(s) of the postponement to the program and institution.

      iv. A brief description of the benefit(s) of the postponement to the accreditation process.

      v. Requests to postpone visits originally scheduled for the following spring must be received in the NAAB office no later than close of business on July 1. Requests to postpone visits originally scheduled for the fall must be received in the NAAB office no later than close of business on March 1.

      vi. Requests to postpone visits may be submitted after the due date only when a catastrophic event renders the program incapable of hosting the visit as scheduled. Under this circumstance, the program is required to contact the NAAB executive director prior to submitting the request.

      vii. Requests may be submitted in electronic format only.

         1. Applications are limited to 3 pages and 200 KB, including all supplemental information.

         2. The request is to be sent either in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF.

         3. Requests are to be addressed to the Executive Director, NAAB, at info@naab.org with a copy to forum@naab.org. Please include "Request for Postponement of Regularly Scheduled Visit – [Name of Institution]" in the subject line.

   b. **Action on the Request**. Decisions to grant or deny a request for a postponement will be made by the NAAB executive committee at its next

regularly scheduled meeting. The results of the decision will be communicated by a letter addressed to the institution's chief academic officer within seven calendar days of the executive committee's decision.

c. **Special Circumstances**. In the event of a natural disaster or other catastrophic incident, a program may request a postponement of a regularly scheduled visit without regard to the deadlines described above. In the event of such a request, the program is advised to contact the NAAB executive director immediately.

2. **Request to Advance the Date for a Regularly Scheduled Visit for Initial Accreditation**. Occasionally, programs in candidacy for accreditation may wish to advance the date for a visit for initial accreditation from the fall semester to the preceding spring.

a. **Procedure for Requesting an Advancement.** The procedure for requesting a spring visit for initial accreditation is as follows:

i. A written request to advance the date of the visit for initial accreditation from the institution's chief academic officer is sent to the NAAB. This request must include:

1. A brief description of the reason(s) for requesting the earlier date.

2. A brief description of the benefit(s) of advancing the date to the program and institution.

3. A brief description of the benefit(s) of advancing the date to the accreditation process.

ii. Requests to advance the date for visits originally scheduled for the fall must be received in the NAAB office no later than close of business on July 1 one year prior to the originally scheduled visit for initial accreditation.

iii. Applications may be submitted in electronic format only.

1. Applications are limited to 3 pages and 200 KB, including all supplemental information.

2. The request is to be sent either in Microsoft Word or Adobe PDF.

3. Requests are to be addressed to the Executive Director, NAAB, at info@naab.org with a copy to cpair@naab.org. Please include "Request for Advancing Regularly Scheduled Visit – [Name of Institution]" in the subject line.

b. **Action on the Request**. Decisions to grant or deny a request for advancing the date of a visit for initial accreditation will be made by the NAAB executive committee at its next regularly scheduled meeting. The results of the decision will be communicated by a letter addressed to the institution's chief academic officer within seven calendar days of the executive committee's decision.

3. **Early Termination of a Visit**

a. Visits may be terminated only under extreme circumstances or catastrophic conditions. These include the following:

   1. Incomplete team due to illness or extended travel delay.

   2. Poor preparation by the program.

   3. The team room is inadequate or incomplete.

   4. The program is unable to provide adequate information when requested by the team.

   5. Inadequate facilities and arrangements for the team.

   6. Inability to follow schedule in an appropriate way.

   7. Failure by any member of the team to comply substantially with established accreditation procedures.

   8. Unanticipated crisis beyond the control of the program, institution, or team (e.g., weather emergency, state or national emergencies, or illness or death).

b. The determination that the visit is compromised and that termination is likely must be made by the entire team and only after consultation with the program, university administrators, and the NAAB executive director. If a team agrees that a visit is sufficiently compromised, the team chair calls an immediate meeting with the program administrator, his/her superior, and the institution's chief academic officer to outline the choices available to the program.

c. The following options are available:

   1. Terminate the visit, to be rescheduled at a later time.

   2. Continue the visit, after evaluating the potential consequences to the outcome or potential disruption to the procedures.

d. If a visit must be terminated and rescheduled because of the program's failure to prepare appropriately, the chief academic officer of the institution is notified that accreditation may lapse as a result.

4. **Request for Reinstating Accreditation**

A request for reinstatement following revocation or in the event that a program's accreditation expires must be made by an institution's chief academic officer. The procedure for reinstatement is the same as that for candidacy and initial accreditation, as described in Section 4. For programs requesting reinstatement, the minimum period of candidacy is one year.

5. **Programs at Remote Locations**

The NAAB recognizes that institutions continue to seek innovative ways in which to deliver curricula leading to a NAAB-accredited degree. These innovations may vary from individual courses offered in unique settings (e.g., urban design centers) to dual-campus institutions, where a single curriculum is delivered in part or in full by the same faculty at more than one location. For the purpose of accreditation of a first

professional degree in architecture accredited by the NAAB, the following definitions apply:

a. **Definitions**

      i. **Branch Campuses Requiring Separate Accreditation**. A branch campus is a location that is geographically apart from and independent of the accredited program offered at the main/flagship campus of the institution, is permanent in nature, offers at least 50 percent of the curriculum leading to a NAAB-accredited degree, or has a curriculum that differs significantly from that offered at the main/flagship campus, has its own faculty and administrative/supervisory organization, including committee structures, and has its own budgetary and hiring authority. Students and faculty are engaged in committees or professional organizations that are unique to the branch campus. Opportunities for research and scholarship are controlled at the branch campus. NAAB-accredited programs offered at branch campuses must be accredited separately from those offered at the main campus (e.g., the University of California system or the University of Texas system). For the purposes of accreditation, institutional partnerships to offer a NAAB-accredited program at more than one main/flagship campus of more than one institution will be considered under this definition.

      ii. **Additional Site as Part of a Single Accredited Program.** An additional site is a location that is geographically apart from, but not independent of, the accredited program at the main/flagship campus or its organizational control and management. There is one dean and/or administrative head with overall responsibility for the program and one committee structure serving the programmatic needs of the additional site and the main campus site (i.e., one curriculum committee, one grievance committee, and one admissions committee). Faculty, staff, and students are integrated into the academic, professional, and social life of the program at the main campus. This includes faculty and students from the additional sites being engaged in committees and professional organizations, and having comparable access to scholarly and research activities. Programs offered at a main campus and at an additional site are accredited together as a single program.

      iii. **Teaching Site and Study Abroad as Part of a Single Accredited Program.** A teaching site is a location that is geographically apart from, but not independent, of the accredited program. It is used only for instruction during a specific course or single-semester sequence. The teaching site allows the program to meet the needs of different course components within a single curriculum. Teaching sites and study abroad programs are reviewed within the context of the curriculum for the NAAB-accredited program.

      iv. **Online Learning as Part of a Single Accredited Program**. For the purposes of accreditation, courses offered online will be considered under the definition of teaching sites, unless more than 40 percent

(credit hours) of the total NAAB-accredited curriculum is delivered online or the on-campus residency requirement is less than six weeks. In such cases, the online program will be considered an additional site, providing that the online and on-ground curricula are the same.

b. **Determination of Accreditation Status for Remote Locations or Additional Sites.** In the APR submitted for a visit for continuing accreditation, the program must include its responses to the Branch Campus Questionnaire found in Appendix 4 and a narrative description of its remote locations, additional sites, teaching sites, and online learning using the definitions above. The narrative must address the following matters:

   i. Curriculum

   ii. Geographic location

   iii. Administrative structure

   iv. Budgetary and hiring authority and responsibilities

   v. Faculty access to committee assignments, research and scholarship opportunities, and participation in professional societies

   vi. Student access to services and equipment, and participation in governance

   vii. Physical resources

The responses to the questionnaire and the narrative taken together will be used by the team chair and the NAAB staff to determine which category to assign and what additional requirements may be added to the visit. The program will be notified no later than January 1 as to what adjustments may be needed for the visit. The criteria for the determination of the status of the remote programs are outlined below.

c. **Separate APRs and Separate Site Visits.** Programs on branch campuses will be treated as unique, individually accredited programs and will follow the procedures outlined in Section 5, Procedures for Continuing Accreditation. This will require a separate APR and a separate visit. See Section 2.2.a.iii for additional information.

d. **Expanded APR and Extended Visit**

   i. Programs with additional sites, teaching sites, or online learning are required to describe these sites in the APR and to identify the role(s) that these sites play in the ability of the program to deliver the curriculum leading to the accredited degree or the ability of the institution to meet its mission.

   ii. Visits to additional sites or teaching sites may be included in the regularly scheduled visit to the accredited program. The site visit may be extended by up to two days to accommodate the visit to the additional or teaching sites. The additional or teaching sites will be visited by the visiting team chair and one other member of the team. NOTE: Teaching sites located outside the U.S. may be visited by the

73

team chair only; the decision to do so is made by the chair after review of the APR and in consultation with the NAAB.

e. **New Programs at Branch Campuses or Additional Sites**

   i. Institutions initiating new programs at branch campuses will be treated as unique, individual programs and will be required to follow the procedures for candidacy and initial accreditation as outlined in Section 4.

   ii. Programs initiating or altering additional sites, teaching sites, or online learning must provide this information in the *Interim Progress Report* at the time the changes are made or considered. When the program prepares its next APR, the team chair and the NAAB staff will determine whether additional time will be added to the visit to review the new or altered sites.

f. **Review of Student Work**
NAAB visiting teams shall have access to student work completed at other locations or online. There are several options for this review. The team chair, program administrator, and NAAB staff should consult on the method that best meets the needs of the visit. These options include:

   i. Establishing a team room at the additional or teaching site and displaying student work there. In this case, a day will be added to the visit.

   ii. Displaying student work from the additional or teaching site in the team room at the primary location for the program. The work must be clearly identified as having been produced by students at the additional or teaching site.

   iii. In all cases, the institution will coordinate the location of the display and logistics of the visit with the team chair prior to the accreditation visit.

g. **Visiting Team Report**
In all cases, the NAAB *Visiting Team Report* shall address the additional sites, teaching sites, or online learning relative to the conformance of their administrative structure, financial responsibilities, equipment and facilities, student demographics, curriculum, and student/faculty governance policies to those of the main/flagship campus.

The evaluative essence of the accreditation process is to assure the profession and the public that the conditions and performance standards for accreditation, as measured through institutional and student performance criteria, have been achieved at all sites at which the NAAB-accredited degree is offered.

SECTION 8. CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The NAAB and its volunteer leaders are dedicated to serving in the most honorable and ethical manner possible. Among the NAAB's responsibilities is providing assurances that debates, decision-making, and governance at the NAAB are conducted in an objective and bias-free context. Thus, the NAAB seeks to avoid both real and perceived conflicts of interest in its procedures, deliberations, and accrediting decisions.

No person shall take part as a visiting team member[7] and no Board member shall participate in an accrediting decision or the deliberations leading thereto if he/she cannot evaluate a program objectively and without bias, even if none of the categories for automatic disqualification set forth below apply. The term "program" shall include, in addition to the program specifically to be evaluated, any previous program, substitute program, or other program at the institution, regardless of its degree title, that has received or is seeking NAAB accreditation.

1. **Definitions**. The following are considered conflicts of interest:

   a. Being an employee, current or former student, or graduate of the program being evaluated or the institution at which it is located.

   b. Having a close association with currently employed administrative or faculty personnel in the program or at the institution at which the program is located (e.g., a spouse or former colleague).

   c. Having a member of one's immediate family (including the spouse, former spouse, child, parent, or sibling and the immediate family of the spouse, child, or sibling) currently enrolled in or seeking enrollment in the program or the institution at which it is located (e.g., a son or daughter enrolled in the institution or program).

   d. Having a member of one's immediate family (including the spouse, former spouse, child, parent, or sibling and the immediate family of the spouse, child, or sibling) employed by or currently seeking employment with the institution in which the program is located.

   e. Being a donor or providing other resources and support to the program or institution at which it is located.

   f. Having had a limited relationship (paid or unpaid) with the program being evaluated as a temporary employee, visiting faculty member, award recipient, speaker on more than one occasion, volunteer teacher or mentor, or consultant within the 10 years prior to the visit.

   g. Having sought (successfully or unsuccessfully) at any time in the 10 years prior to the visit permanent employment or a relationship of the types set forth above.

   h. Demonstrating that he/she holds a preconceived opinion based on the type of program to be evaluated, its reputation, the underlying philosophy of the program, the extent of expected faculty research, or the extent to which it is an undergraduate or graduate program (e.g., through written or recorded remarks or materials).

---

[7] There are special provisions for non-voting team members regarding their status as alumni or former employees of a NAAB-accredited program. Please see page 76 below and Section 5, pp. 47-48, for additional information.

2. **Team Member Disclosure**

   a. Team members must disclose all conflicts of interest, real or potential, to the NAAB staff, the visiting team chair, and the program administrator no less than five days after being assigned to a team in order to determine whether the assigned individual should or should not participate in a specific team.

   b. The NAAB will not assign an individual to serve on a visiting team to evaluate a program if it appears that the individual has a real or potential conflict of interest that would raise a question as to that individual's objectivity in evaluating the program.

   c. Team members, including non-voting members, are responsible for determining and reporting whenever they have a conflict of interest, or appearance of a conflict of interest, with regard to a particular accreditation matter.[8] Before serving as a team member or participating in any decision on the matter, an individual shall inform the NAAB if such a conflict or the appearance of a conflict exists.

   d. An individual, in determining whether he/she should be disqualified from participation, shall consider, even in the absence of a true conflict of interest, whether the potential appearance of a conflict of interest is sufficiently serious to dictate the individual's withdrawal from the team.

3. **NAAB Director Disclosure**

   a. The NAAB directors are required to disclose conflicts of interest annually. These disclosures are kept on file in the NAAB office.

   b. Further, NAAB directors are required to recuse themselves from deliberating and voting on a specific accreditation decision if a conflict of interest, real or perceived, exists.

   c. In the event that a NAAB director has a direct relationship with a program currently under review, that director is excluded from all decision-making and is barred from reading the VTR and the team's recommendation.

Exceptions to the above policy may be made if approved by the program administrator in writing or if the program fails to make a timely objection to a team member substitution that is necessary on short notice.

---

[8] Non-voting members are sometimes alumni or individuals otherwise considered "friends" of the program. These relationships do not necessarily preclude an individual from serving as a non-voting member; however, they must be identified and reported to the NAAB office and the team chair prior to an individual's being approved as a non-voting member of a team. These relationships are to be documented in the VTR under Team Comments.

SECTION 9. ANNUAL STATISTICAL REPORTS

Continuing accreditation and candidacy are subject to the submission of *Annual Statistical Reports*.

Annual Statistical Reports are submitted online through the NAAB's Annual Report Submission (ARS) system (http://ars.naab.org) and are due by November 30 of each year. For specific information or instructions on how to complete *Annual Statistical Reports*, please refer to the ARS website.

1. **Annual Statistical Report**

   a. **Content.** This report captures statistical information on the institution in which an architecture program is located and on the accredited degree program. For the purposes of the report, the definitions are taken from the glossary of terms used by the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS).[9] Much of the information requested in this report corresponds to the *Institutional Characteristics, Completion and 12-Month Enrollment Report* submitted to IPEDS in the fall by the institution. Data submitted in this section is for the previous fiscal year.

   b. **Submission.** *Annual Statistical Reports* are submitted through the NAAB's Annual Report Submission system and are due on November 30.

   c. **Fine for Late Annual Statistical Report.** *Annual Statistical Reports* are due each year on November 30. In the event that a program fails to complete an *Annual Statistical Report* on time, including not more than one extension, the program will be assessed a fine of $100.00 per calendar day until the *Annual Statistical Report* is submitted. This fine will be assessed when the report is submitted.

   d. **Failure to Submit an Annual Statistical Report**. If an acceptable *Annual Statistical Report* is not submitted to the NAAB by the deadline, the NAAB may advise the chief academic officer and program administrator of the failure to comply. In the event that the program fails to request an extension and fails to submit an acceptable *Annual Statistical Report* by January 31, the NAAB executive committee may consider advancing the program's next accreditation sequence by at least one calendar year. In such cases, the chief academic officer of the institution will be notified, with copies to the program administrator, and a schedule will be determined so that the program has at least six months to prepare an APR.

---

[9] IPEDS is the "core postsecondary data collection program for the National Center for Education Statistics. Data are collected from all primary providers of postsecondary education in the [U.S.] in areas including enrollments, program completions, graduation rates, faculty, staff, finances, institutional prices, and student financial aid." For more information, see http://nces.ed.gov/IPEDS/

SECTION 10. INTERIM PROGRESS REPORTS

Continuing accreditation is subject to the submission of a narrative *Interim Progress Report* submitted at defined intervals after an eight-year or four-year term of continuing accreditation is approved.

Programs with two-year probationary terms are exempt from this requirement.

Annual Statistical Reports (Section 9) are still required, regardless of a program's interim reporting requirements.

Interim Progress Reports are due on November 30 at defined intervals after the most recent visit and are also submitted through the ARS (see Section 9, Annual Statistical Reports).

    1. **Interim Progress Report**

        a. **For Programs with Eight-Year Terms**. Any program receiving an eight-year term of accreditation must submit two *Interim Progress Reports*.

            i. The first report is due on November 30 two years after the most recent visit and shall address all sections in the interim report template (see note in Appendix 3).

            ii. The second report is due on November 30 five years after the most recent visit and shall address at least Section 3 of the template, although additional information may be requested by the NAAB (see below).

            iii. Content: This is a narrative report supported by evidence as outlined in the instructions, which covers three areas:

                1. The program's response to, or progress in addressing, not-met Conditions or SPC, or Causes of Concern from the most recent VTR.

                2. Significant changes to the program or the institution since the last visit.

                3. Changes to the program's responses to Conditions I.1-I.5 since the previous *Architecture Program Report* was submitted. In this section, the program must clearly distinguish new or amended text from that provided in the template.

        b. **For Programs with Four-Year Terms**. Any program receiving a four-year term of accreditation must submit one *Interim Progress Report*.

            1. This report is due on November 30 two years after the most recent visit and shall address all sections in the interim report template (see note in Appendix 3).

            2. Content: This is a narrative report supported by evidence as outlined in the instructions, which covers three areas:

                a. The program's response to, or progress in addressing, not-met Conditions or SPC, or Causes of Concern from the most recent VTR.

    b. Significant changes to the program or the institution since the last visit.

    c. Changes to the program's responses to Conditions I.1-I.5 since the previous APR was submitted. In this section, the program must clearly distinguish new or amended text from that provided in the template.

  c. **Submission.** *Interim Progress Reports* are due on November 30. They are submitted electronically through the ARS in Word or PDF. The reports must use the template (see note in Appendix 3). Files may not exceed 5 MBs.

  d. **Review for Programs with Eight-Year Terms**

    i. Two-year *Interim Progress Reports* are reviewed by a panel of at least three people: one current NAAB director, one former NAAB director, and one experienced team chair.[10] This panel will be assembled by the NAAB staff. The panel may make one of three recommendations to the Board regarding the acceptance of the first interim report:

      1. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent VTR; only the mandatory section of the fifth-year report is required. The *Annual Statistical Report* (Section 9, Annual Statistical Reports) is still required.

      2. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent VTR; the fifth-year report must include additional materials or address additional sections. The *Annual Statistical Report* (Section 9) is still required.

      3. Reject the interim report as having not demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies, and advance the next accreditation sequence by at least one calendar year, but not more than three years, therefore shortening the term of accreditation. In such cases, the chief academic officer of the institution will be notified, with copies to the program administrator, and a schedule will be determined so that the program has at least six months to prepare an APR. The *Annual Statistical Report* (Section 9) is still required.

    ii. Five-year *Interim Progress Reports* are also reviewed by a panel composed in the same manner as described above. The panel may make one of two recommendations to the Board regarding the acceptance of the report:

      1. Accept the fifth-year interim report as having demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent VTR.

---

[10] The experienced team chair will not have participated in a team during the year in which the original decision on a term of accreditation was made.

2. Reject the fifth-year interim report as having not demonstrated sufficient progress toward addressing deficiencies, and advance the next accreditation sequence by at least one calendar year, but not more than three years. In such cases, the chief academic officer of the institution will be notified, with copies to the program administrator, and a schedule will be determined so that the program has at least six months to prepare an APR.

3. The *Annual Statistical Report* (Section 9, Annual Statistical Reports) is still required in either of the above cases.

e. **Review for Programs with Four-Year Terms**. Two-year *Interim Progress Reports* are reviewed by the same panel that reviews two-year IPRs from programs with eight-year terms. This panel will be assembled by the NAAB staff. The panel may make one of two recommendations to the Board regarding the acceptance of the first interim report:

1. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated satisfactory progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent VTR. There are no additional requirements or documents required for the APR. The *Annual Statistical Report* (Section 9) is still required.

2. Accept the interim report as having demonstrated progress toward addressing deficiencies identified in the most recent VTR; the next APR must include additional materials or address additional sections. The *Annual Statistical Report* (Section 9) is still required.

f. **Failure to Submit.** If an acceptable *Interim Progress Report* is not submitted to the NAAB by the deadline, the NAAB may advise the chief academic officer and program administrator of the failure to comply. If the program fails to submit an acceptable IPR by January 31, the NAAB executive committee may consider advancing the program's next accreditation visit by at least one calendar year, but not more than three years.

g. **Fine for Late Interim Progress Report.** *Interim Progress Reports* are due each year on November 30. In the event that a program fails to complete an IPR on time, including not more than one extension, the program will be assessed a fine of $100.00 per calendar day until the IPR is submitted. This fine will be assessed when the report is submitted.

h. **Decision.** The panel's recommendation on any *Interim Progress Report* will be forwarded to the Board at its next regularly scheduled meeting.

1. The responsibility for the final decision rests with the NAAB Board of Directors.

2. Decisions of the NAAB on an *Interim Progress Report* are not subject to reconsideration or appeal.

SECTION 11. COMPLAINTS ABOUT PROGRAMS

Individuals who wish to file a complaint about an accredited program must do so in writing.

1. A letter, addressed to the NAAB president, and sent to the NAAB office at 1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 410, Washington, DC 20036, must include the following:

    a. A description of the specific nature or subject of the complaint.

    b. A description of the impact on the accreditation of the program of the failure of the program or institution to address the subject of the complaint.

    c. A reference to the specific *Conditions for Accreditation* that may be compromised as a result of the program's failure to address the subject of the complaint.

    d. Evidence that the complainant has exhausted all other institutional means for resolving the issue.

2. Upon receiving a written complaint about a program, the NAAB will notify the program that a complaint has been received. The NAAB will make every effort to ensure that the complainant's identity is kept confidential. The NAAB will request a response from the program.

3. The complaint and response are presented for review at the next Board meeting. At that time, the Board may consider the following:

    a. Take no action.

    b. Require the program to address the matter of the complaint in the next *Interim Progress Report* and subsequent APR.

    c. Append the complaint and response to the next VTR or Substantive Change Review Report (see Section 6, Substantive Changes Requiring Review by the NAAB), to be considered as part of the record for the next accreditation action.

4. The NAAB will not consider complaints from students about grades given in specific courses within NAAB-accredited programs.

5. Complaints may be filed at any time during a program's current accreditation cycle. Complaints about matters that arose prior to the most recent visit will not be considered.

SECTION 12. RECONSIDERATIONS

Programs may request reconsideration of Board action regarding terms of accreditation or of Board decisions to deny or revoke accreditation. When making a request for reconsideration, the program must present evidence that either of the following is true:

- The Board's decision is not supported by factual evidence cited in the record, or

- The NAAB and/or visiting team failed to comply substantially with established accreditation procedures, and any such departure significantly affected the decision.

Reconsiderations may not be requested for the following:

- Failure of the program to provide information to the NAAB and/or the visiting team in a timely manner.

- Board action regarding the acceptance of APRs or *Interim Progress Reports*.

Reconsiderations are conducted by the NAAB directors. The filing of a request for a reconsideration automatically delays implementation of the Board's accreditation decision.

1. **Initiating a Reconsideration**

   a. The reconsideration must be requested by the chief academic officer of the institution within 14 calendar days of receiving the NAAB's accreditation decision.

   b. The request is sent to the NAAB executive director.

   c. The request must identify the incorrect or insufficient factual information cited by the NAAB in support of the decision and/or evidence of the visiting team's failure to comply with established accreditation procedures and evidence that such failure significantly affected the accreditation decision.

   d. The request must be sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, UPS, or FedEx.

   e. All days refer to regular calendar days, exclusive of national holidays.

2. **Reconsideration Sequence**

   a. Upon receiving the request, the NAAB executive director advises the NAAB president that a reconsideration request has been received.

   b. The NAAB president assigns a NAAB director to oversee the reconsideration until its conclusion at the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board. Other than having participated in the accreditation decision, the director shall have had no prior involvement with the program.

   c. The NAAB director sends the request for reconsideration to the team chair and requests a written response to the assertions of incorrect or insufficient evidence and/or the failure of the visiting team to comply with established procedures.

   d. In the event that the request is based on the failure of the Board to comply with established procedures, the Board representative sends the request for reconsideration to the NAAB executive director and requests a written response to the assertion of failure by the Board to comply with established procedures.

e. The Board representative, using the VTR, the program's response to the VTR, the program's request for reconsideration, the visiting team chair's response, and the executive director's response, shall prepare a written analysis of the issues.

f. The written analysis is sent to the chief academic officer of the institution, the visiting team chair, and the NAAB executive director.

g. Upon receiving the Board representative's analysis, the chief academic officer of the institution may request either one of the following:

    i. A reconsideration on the record, or

    ii. A reconsideration hearing at the next regularly scheduled Board of Directors meeting.

h. Reconsideration on the record

    i. If the program requests reconsideration on the record, the reconsideration will be added to the agenda for the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board.

    ii. The agenda item will include the following background material:

        1. The VTR.

        2. The program's response to the VTR.

        3. The program's request for reconsideration.

        4. The visiting team chair's response.

        5. The NAAB executive director's response.

        6. The Board representative's analysis.

    iii. If the team chair has subsequently become a NAAB director, he/she is excused from the deliberations.

    iv. The NAAB directors review the record and determine whether to reconsider the accreditation decision. At least eight members of the Board must vote in favor of a motion to reconsider the decision.

    v. Reconsideration of the accreditation decision

        1. If the motion to reconsider is approved, a new motion on the accreditation action will be made.

        2. Any new motion regarding a reconsidered term of accreditation must be based only on materials provided in the record.

        3. Any new motion regarding a reconsidered term of accreditation must have at least eight votes in favor to pass.

    vi. Not less than seven calendar days after the meeting of the Board of Directors where the term of accreditation was reconsidered, the NAAB president shall send the institution the decision. This letter will include reasons supporting the decision as recorded by the Board representative.

i. Reconsideration Hearing. The hearing has two stages.

i. Determination to Grant Reconsideration

1. If the program requests a reconsideration hearing, the chief academic officer of the institution and the Board representative may make a written request to the NAAB executive director naming persons required at the hearing. The executive director shall invite these persons, but cannot ensure their attendance. Such requests must be made at least 14 calendar days before the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Board of Directors.

2. During the Board meeting, the Board recesses from its regular business and reconvenes for the reconsideration hearing. The Board representative serves as chair. In attendance shall be the NAAB directors, the NAAB executive director, representatives of the institution as determined by the institution, and the visiting team chair.

3. The Board representative opens the hearing by introducing the participants and explaining the procedure to be followed.

4. Representative(s) of the institution will present their position, confining it to issues of either incorrect or insufficient factual information and/or evidence that the visiting team or the Board failed to comply with accreditation procedures and this failure affected the accreditation decision.

5. Within the same limits, the visiting team chair and the president of NAAB may present the position of the team and the Board, respectively.

6. The Board representative may question any attendee and, solely at his/her discretion, may direct questions from Board members to the institution and vice versa.

7. The institution's representative(s) make a closing statement, which concludes the reconsideration hearing, after which the institution's representatives and the visiting team chair are excused.

8. The NAAB directors review the evidence and determine whether to reconsider the accreditation decision. At least eight members of the Board must vote in favor of a motion to reconsider the decision.

ii. Reconsideration of the Accreditation Decision

1. If the motion to reconsider is approved, the reconsideration hearing will adjourn and the Board will reconvene in its regular meeting. The president will resume the chair.

2. Any new motion regarding a reconsidered term of accreditation must be based on information available to the visiting team with respect only to those matters that served as the basis for granting

the reconsideration. The Board may take the steps deemed necessary to review material available to the visiting team but not contained in the APR or VTR.

3. Any new motion regarding a reconsidered term of accreditation must have at least eight votes in favor to pass.

4. Not less than seven calendar days after the meeting of the Board of Directors where the term of accreditation was reconsidered, the NAAB president shall send the institution the decision. This letter will include reasons supporting the decision as recorded by the Board designee.

SECTION 13. APPEAL OF A RECONSIDERATION DECISION

Programs may appeal the denial of a reconsideration decision only in the instance of a revocation decision. By entering an appeal process, the institution agrees to accept the ruling of the appeal panel as final.

Appeals may only be made on the following grounds:

- The NAAB decision to deny the reconsideration request was not supported by sufficient factual evidence cited in the record.

- The Board of Directors failed to comply substantially with NAAB procedures, and this departure significantly affected the decision to deny the reconsideration request.

Failure of the program to provide information to the NAAB in a timely manner cannot provide a basis for requesting an appeal of a reconsideration decision.

Neither the program nor the NAAB may raise issues in the appeal that were not raised in the request for reconsideration.

An appeal is conducted by persons selected to represent educators, practitioners, and students or recent graduates.

1. **Initiating the Appeal**

    a. To initiate an appeal hearing, the chief academic officer of the institution must send a written request within 14 calendar days of receiving official notice of the reconsideration decision. The request must include a specific response to the reconsideration decision.

    b. The request is sent to the NAAB executive director.

    c. The request must identify the incorrect or insufficient factual information cited by the NAAB in support of the decision and/or evidence of the Board's failure to comply with NAAB procedures and evidence that this failure significantly affected the reconsideration decision.

    d. The request must be sent by certified mail, return receipt requested, UPS, or FedEx.

    e. All days refer to regular calendar days, exclusive of national holidays.

    f. The filing of a request for an appeal automatically delays implementation of the Board's original accreditation decision.

2. **Appeal Sequence**

    a. Selecting the Appeal Panel

        i. The AIA, ACSA, AIAS, and NCARB are informed that an appeal has been filed and are asked to submit to the NAAB president a list of persons who are full-time educators, full-time practitioners, current students, or recent graduates (not more than one year following graduation), who are willing to serve on an appeal panel and who have never been involved with either the institution or the reconsideration decision under appeal.

ii. The NAAB president draws from this list to propose an appeal panel composed of five persons: two educators, two practitioners, and one student.

iii. Within 14 calendar days of receiving a request for an appeal hearing, the NAAB executive director forwards the proposed membership of the panel to the chief academic officer of the institution and proposes a date and place for convening the panel.

iv. Within seven calendar days of receiving the proposed panel membership, the chief academic officer either notifies the NAAB executive director that the panel is acceptable or challenges no more than two proposed members. In the latter case, the NAAB executive director will appoint replacements, after which the membership of the appeal panel is final.

v. The NAAB president, in consultation with the executive director, selects a member of the approved appeal panel to serve as the panel chair.

b. Appeal Panel Review of the Record

i. The appeal panel receives and reviews the program's APR and VTR, the program's response to the VTR, materials reviewed or presented during the reconsideration hearing, the institution's response to the reconsideration decision, and the NAAB's response to the program's assertions.

ii. The appeal panel chair reviews the record, the format for the hearing, and any policies, correspondence, and documents that are applicable to the appeal hearing with the executive director.

iii. After the initial review, the appeal panel chair and the chief academic officer of the institution determine a time and place for the hearing.

c. Appeal Hearing

i. The appeal panel chair convenes the appeal hearing. In attendance are the appeal panel, the NAAB president and Board representative (see Section 12), the visiting team chair, the NAAB executive director, and not more than three representatives of the institution as determined by the institution.

ii. The appeal panel chair opens the hearing by introducing the participants and explaining the procedure to be followed.

iii. A representative(s) of the institution first presents the institution's position, confining it to issues of incorrect or insufficient factual information cited by the NAAB in support of the decision to deny the reconsideration request and/or evidence that the failure of the Board to comply with NAAB procedures significantly affected the reconsideration decision.

iv. A representative of the NAAB presents the Board's position, confining it to responding to the assertions of the program regarding information used to make the reconsideration request and/or evidence that the Board complied with NAAB procedures in making the reconsideration decision.

v.   The appeal panel chair may question any attendee.

vi.   The appeal panel chair calls a recess so that the panel may consider whether to receive or request additional material for the record.

vii.   The NAAB's representative makes a closing statement.

viii.   The institution's representative makes a closing statement, which concludes the appeal hearing.

ix.   At the conclusion of the appeal hearing, all institutional and NAAB representatives are excused.

d. Appeal Decision

    i.   The panel convenes in executive session to rule on whether the reconsideration decision is upheld.

       1. If the reconsideration decision is upheld, the following occurs:

          a.   The appeal panel chair prepares a statement to be signed by the members of the appeal panel, which states that the reconsideration decision is upheld, and delivers it to the NAAB office within seven calendar days of the appeal hearing.

          b.   Within seven calendar days of its receipt, the NAAB president forwards the statement to the chief academic officer of the institution.

       2. If the reconsideration decision is not upheld, the following occurs:

          a.   The appeal panel identifies the factual evidence found to be incorrect or insufficient to support the NAAB decision to deny a reconsideration request and/or those lapses in compliance by the Board with NAAB procedures that significantly affected the reconsideration decision.

          b.   The appeal panel chair prepares a report containing the appeal panel decision and the reasons supporting it, and delivers the report to the NAAB office within seven calendar days of the appeal hearing.

          c.   Within seven calendar days of its receipt, the NAAB executive director forwards the report to the chief academic officer of the institution.

          d.   The NAAB immediately takes steps to correct factual evidence as specified in the appeal panel report and to have the NAAB make a new reconsideration decision in light of the corrections. This new reconsideration decision is subject to appeal, as if it were an original reconsideration decision.

3. **Decision**. The ruling of the appeal panel is final.

4. **Expenses.** The institution shall bear the expenses directly associated with the hearing, such as those for preparing documents, special services requested at the hearing, and meeting rooms; for the travel, meals, and lodging of its representatives; and for the support and travel of the appeal panel. The institution shall bear the expense of having witnesses appear at its request, and the NAAB shall do the same.

SECTION 14. SEQUENCE INFOGRAPHICS

APPENDICES

1. Team Member Pool Nomination Forms
2. History of the NAAB
3. Report Templates
4. Branch Campus Questionnaire
5. Reimbursement Policy
6. List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

TEAM MEMBER POOL NOMINATION
JANUARY 1, 2016-JANUARY 1, 2020

Name: **Date:**

Address (home):   **Address (office/professional):**

Telephone (preferred):   **Email (preferred):**

Team Member Designation: Please select one of the following. You will be designated in the team member pool as either an educator or practitioner. Please select the designation that most closely describes your current role in the profession.

☐ **Educator** (more than 50% of time spent as a full-time educator, member of a faculty, program administrator, or institutional leader)

☐ **Practitioner** (more than 50% of time spent working as a licensed professional)

Educational Credentials:

Institution	Years Attended	Degree Awarded

Teaching Experience (since 2004):

Institution	Years Attended	Degree Awarded

Practice Experience (since 2004):

Firm	Years Affiliated	Location(s)

Supplemental Experience (since 2004): (For educators, this section could include experience in practice, whether you are an Architect Licensing Advisor, and participation in committees or task forces appointed by the AIA, AIAS, ACSA, or NCARB. For practitioners, this section could include experience teaching as an adjunct or other part-time appointment, service to an institution with a NAAB-accredited program, as well as service on committees or task forces appointed by the AIA, AIAS, ACSA, or NCARB.)

Firm/Institution	Years Affiliated	Nature of the affiliation

Licenses/Registration (This is a list of the U.S. jurisdictions in which you are currently registered to practice)**:**

Other (Include additional information about your experience or education that supplements or complements information already provided on this form):

Individuals in either category should indicate the following:

National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

TEAM MEMBER POOL NOMINATION
JANUARY 1, 2016-JANUARY 1, 2020

☐ **NCARB Member Board Member** Please check this box if you are a current or former member of an NCARB member board.

☐ **IDP Mentor or Supervisor** Please indicate whether you have experience as an IDP supervisor or mentor.

National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

TEAM MEMBER POOL NOMINATION: STUDENTS
JANUARY 1, 2016-JANUARY 1, 2017

Name: **Date:**

Address (home):   **Address (office/professional):**

Telephone (preferred):   **Email (preferred):**

Team Member Designation: You will be designated in the team member pool as a student if you are currently enrolled in a NAAB-accredited program or are a recent graduate and currently enrolled in IDP. NAAB reserves the right to confirm your enrollment in IDP with the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards.

Educational Credentials:

Institution	Years Attended	Degree Awarded

Intern Development Program Experience:
- ☐ Currently enrolled. Please provide your Council Record number:
- ☐ Not currently enrolled

Supplemental Experience (since 2004): (Please include information about your affiliation with the AIAS, Freedom x Design; other community services projects or programs; councils or governing bodies within your program)

Organization/Project	Years Affiliated	Nature of the affiliation

Other (Include additional information about your experience or education that supplements or complements information already provided on this form):

Appendix 2: History of the NAAB

The first step leading to architectural accreditation was taken in Illinois, where the first legislation regulating the practice of architecture was enacted in 1897. Following that enactment, the Illinois Board of Examiners and Regulators of Architects gave its first examination in 1898 and, by 1902, had established a rule restricting the examination to graduates of the state's approved 4-year architecture curriculum. In 1903, the board expanded this policy to include graduates from Cornell, Columbia, and Harvard Universities, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and the University of Pennsylvania. That action suggested the need for national standards of architectural education.

The first attempt to establish national standards came with the founding of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA) in 1912 and its adoption 2 years later of "standard minima" that schools were required to meet to gain ACSA membership. While these standard minima were in place, ACSA membership was equivalent to accreditation.

In 1932, the ACSA abandoned the standard minima, causing an 8-year hiatus in the profession's national system of education—a hiatus brought to an end when the ACSA, the American Institute of Architects (AIA), and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB) established the NAAB and gave it authority to accredit schools of architecture nationally.

The founding agreement of 1940 also announced the intention to create an integrated system of architectural education that would allow schools with varying resources and circumstances to develop according to their particular needs.

Today, the NAAB's accreditation system for *professional degree programs* within schools requires a self-assessment by the accredited degree program, an evaluation of that assessment by the NAAB, and a site visit by a NAAB team that concludes with a recommendation to the NAAB as to the term of accreditation. The decision regarding the term of accreditation is then made by the NAAB Board of Directors.

Appendix 3: Report Templates

     A. Visiting Team Reports
     B. Substantive Change Report

NOTE: The following templates are available online at www.naab.org:

Architecture Program Report (Section 2)

Interim Progress Report (Section 10)

Name of University
School of Architecture

2016 Visiting Team Report

B. Arch

M. Arch

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
Date of Visit

Vision: The NAAB aspires to be the leader in establishing educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architectural profession.

Mission: The NAAB develops and maintains a system of accreditation in professional architecture education that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs.

Table of Contents

I.   Summary of Visit

      a.   Acknowledgements and Observations

      b.   Conditions Not Achieved (list number and title)

II.   Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2004/9 Condition/Criterion [quoted in full] [NOTE: This section will be completed by the NAAB staff for each visit]

Previous Team Report (2010):

Previous FE Team Report (2013):

2016 Visiting Team Assessment:

III.   Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

This part addresses the commitment of the institution, its faculty, staff, and students to the development and evolution of the program over time.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 1 – IDENTITY & SELF-ASSESSMENT

I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program's pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.

- The program must describe its active role and relationship within its academic context and university community. This includes the program's benefits to the institutional setting, and how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. This also includes how the program as a unit develops multi-disciplinary relationships and leverage opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the surrounding community.

2016 Analysis/Review: Instructions to the team: write a brief summary of the program's history and mission based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. Limit: ½ page.

I.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages 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.

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy that also includes a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition to the matters identified above, the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.

- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include, but are not limited to field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.

2016 Analysis/Review: Instructions to the team: write a brief summary of the program's learning culture based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. Limit: ½ page.

I.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources.

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students as compared with the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution during the next two accreditation cycles.

- The program must document that institutional, college or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college or institutional-level.

2016 Analysis/Review: Instructions to the team: write a brief summary of the program's learning culture based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. Limit: ½ page.

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that impact the education and development of professional architects. . Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently and to further identify, as part of its long-range planning activities, how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. **Collaboration and Leadership**. The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences and opportunities for leadership roles. Architects serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders.

B. **Design**. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multi-dimensional protocol for both problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value. Graduates should be prepared to engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed to address increasingly complex problems, engage a diverse constituency, and provide value and an improved future.

C. **Professional Opportunity.** The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunity and career paths for architects in both traditional and non-traditional settings; in local and global communities.

D. **Stewardship of the Environment**. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environmental and the natural resources that are significantly compromised by the act of building and constructed human settlements.

E. **Community and Social Responsibility**. The program must describe its approach to developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens able to understand what it means to be a professional member of society and to act on that understanding. The social responsibility of architects lies in part in the belief that architects can create better places, and further that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program's response to social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to civic engagement to positively influence the development, conservation or changes to the built and natural environment

2016 Analysis/Review: Instructions to the team: write a brief summary of the program's learning culture based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. Limit: ½ page.

I.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement with a ratified planning document and / or planning process. . In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely, and from multiple sources to identify patterns and trends, so as to inform its future planning and strategic decision-making. The program must describe how planning at the program level is part of larger strategic plans for the unit, college and university.

2016 Analysis/Review: Instructions to the team: write a brief summary of the program's learning culture based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. Limit: ½ page.

I.1.6 Assessment

A. **Program Self-Assessment Procedures**: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How well the program is progressing towards its mission and stated objectives.

- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives.

- Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.

- Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

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

B. **Curricular Assessment and Development**: The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments and must identify the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

2016 Analysis/Review: Instructions to the team: write a brief summary of the program's learning culture based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. Limit: ½ page.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

The program must demonstrate that it has 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.

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement

- The program must demonstrate that an Intern Development Program (IDP) Educator Coordinator has been appointed, is trained in the issues of IDP, has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Educator Coordinator position description and, regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.

- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.

- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

[ ] Demonstrated

[ ] Not Demonstrated

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

I.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the physical resources available and how they support the pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Physical resources include, but are not limited to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.

- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning including labs, shops, and equipment.

- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

- Information resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

If the program's pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, for example, if online course delivery is employed to complement or supplement onsite learning, then the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, onsite, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

[ ] Described

[ ] Not Described

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

I.2.3 Financial Resources: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[ ] Demonstrated

[ ] Not Demonstrated

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

I.2.4 Information Resources: The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information, as well as appropriate visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

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

[ ] Demonstrated

[ ] Not Demonstrated

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

I.2.5 Administrative Structure & Governance:

- **Administrative Structure:** The program must describe its administrative structure, and identify key personnel, within the context of the program and school, college and institution.

- **Governance**: The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

[ ] Described

[ ] Not Described

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

This part has four sections that address the following:

- **STUDENT PERFORMANCE**. This section includes the Student Performance Criteria (SPC). Programs must demonstrate that graduates are learning at the level of achievement defined for each of the SPC listed in this part. Compliance will be evaluated through the review of student work

- **CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK**. This section addresses the program and institution relative to regional accreditation, degree nomenclature, credit hour requirements, general education and access to optional studies.

- **EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION**. The NAAB recognizes that students entering an accredited program from a preprofessional program and those entering an accredited program from a non-preprofessional degree program have different needs, aptitudes and knowledge bases. In this section, programs will be required to demonstrate the process by which incoming students are evaluated and to document that the SPC expected to have been met in educational experiences in non-accredited programs have indeed been met.

- **PUBLIC INFORMATION**. The NAAB expects accredited degree programs to provide information to the public regarding accreditation activities and the relationship between the program and the NAAB, admissions and advising, and career information, as well as accurate public information concerning the accredited and non-accredited architecture programs.

Programs demonstrate their compliance with Part Two in four ways:

- A narrative report that briefly responds to each request to "describe, document, or demonstrate."

- A review of evidence and artifacts by the visiting team, as well as through interviews and observations conducted during the visit.

- A review of student work that demonstrates student achievement of the SPC at the required level of learning.

- A review of websites, links, and other materials.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE -- EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

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

Instructions to the team:

1. *When an SPC is MET, the team is required to identify the course or courses where evidence of student accomplishment was found.*

2. *If an SPC is NOT MET, the team must include a narrative that indicates the reasoning behind the team's assessment.*

3. *After completing the VTR, the team must prepare an SPC matrix (using a blank provided by the program) that identifies the courses in which the team found the evidence of student achievement. The team's matrix is to be appended to the VTR as Appendix 2.*

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This includes using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing and model making.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Being broadly educated.

- Valuing lifelong inquisitiveness.

- Communicating graphically in a range of media.

- Assessing evidence.

- Comprehending people, place, and context.

- Recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society.

A.1   Professional Communication Skills: *Ability* to write and speak effectively and use appropriate representational media both with peers and with the general public.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

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

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

A.3   Investigative Skills : *Ability to* gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

A.4   Architectural Design Skills: *Ability to* effectively use basic formal, organizational and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

A.5   Ordering Systems: *Ability to apply* the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

A.6   Use of Precedents: *Ability* to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

A.7   History and Culture: *Understanding* of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, settings in terms of their political, economic, social, and technological factors..

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

A.8   Cultural Diversity and Social Equity*: Understanding* of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to buildings and structures.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

Realm A. General Team Commentary: [The team must provide a brief narrative that describes the overall review of student achievement in all elements of Realm D.]

Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. Additionally the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.

- Comprehending constructability.

- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.

- Conveying technical information accurately

B.1   Pre-Design: *Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of spaces and their requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.2   Site Design: *Ability* to respond to site characteristics including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, climate, building orientation, and watershed in the development of a project design.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.3.   Codes and Regulations: *Ability* to design sites, facilities and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

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

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.5   Structural Systems: *Ability to demonstrate* the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravity, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system."

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.6   Environmental Systems: *Understanding* the principles of environmental systems' design, how systems can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This must include active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.7   Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies: *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.8   Building Materials and Assemblies: *Understanding* of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components and assemblies based on their inherent performance including environmental impact and reuse.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.9   Building Service Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems including mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation security, and fire protection systems.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.10   Financial Considerations: *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

> **Realm B. General Team Commentary:** [The team must provide a brief narrative that describes the overall review of student achievement in all elements of Realm D.]

Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution. This realm demonstrates the integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.

- Respond to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.

- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.

C.1   Integrative Design: *Ability* to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

C.2   Evaluation and Decision Making: *Ability* to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

> **Realm C. General Team Commentary:** [The team must provide a brief narrative that describes the overall review of student achievement in all elements of Realm D.]

Realm D: Professional Practice. Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and acting legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Comprehending the business of architecture and construction..

- Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.

- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

D.1   Stakeholder Roles In Architecture: *Understanding* of the relationship between the client, contractor, architect and other key stakeholders such as user groups and the community, in the design of the built environment. Understanding the responsibilities of the architect to reconcile the needs of those stakeholders

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

D.2   Project Management: *Understanding* of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams, identifying work plans, project schedules and time requirements, and recommending project delivery methods.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

D.3   Business Practices: *Understanding* of the basic principles of business practices within the firm including financial management and business planning, marketing, business organization, and entrepreneurialism.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

D.5   Legal Responsibilities: *Understanding* the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

D.6   Professional Ethics: *Understanding* of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice, and understanding the role of the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

Realm D. General Team Commentary: [The team must provide a brief narrative that describes the overall review of student achievement in all elements of Realm D.]

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation:

In order for a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. 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);

2. Institutions located outside the U.S. and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency, may request NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture only with explicit, written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program's country or region. Such agencies must have a system of institutional quality assurance and review. Any institution in this category that is interested in seeking NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs with the following titles: 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 optional studies.

The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Any institution that uses the degree title B. Arch., M. Arch, or D. Arch. for a non-accredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the *Conditions*. Every accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB student performance criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.

- In the event a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted 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.

- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of professional degree program can be understood by a candidate prior to accepting the offer of admission. See also, Condition II.4.6.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the general public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available online. .

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the *exact language* found in the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*, Appendix 1 in catalogs and promotional media.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty and the public:

>   *The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*

>   *The Conditions for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004 depending on the date of the last visit)

>   *The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation* (edition currently in effect)

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that assist them in developing, evaluating, and implementing career, education, and employment plans.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

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 electronically available to the public:

- All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative, Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012)

- All NAAB responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012)

- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB

- The most recent *APR[1]*

- The final edition of the most recent *Visiting Team Report*, including attachments and addenda

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education in architecture. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their websites to the results.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.4.6. Admissions and Advising

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions

- Admissions requirements, admissions decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation, and advanced standing

- Forms and process for the evaluation of pre-professional degree content

- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships

- Student diversity initiatives.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.4.7 Student Financial Information

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.

---

[1] This is understood to be the APR from the previous visit, not the APR for the visit currently in process.

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

PART THREE (III): – ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program is required to submit annual statistical reports in the format required by the NAAB Procedures.

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.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

III.2 Interim Progress Reports. The program must submit interim progress reports to the NAAB (See Section 11, *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation,* 2012 Edition, Amended*).*
[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

IV.   Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

(list number and title; include comments that describe the basis for the team's assessment)

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

The team is required to complete an SPC matrix that identifies the course(s) in which student work demonstrated the program's compliance with Part II. Section 1.

The program is required to provide the team with a blank matrix that identifies courses by number and title on the y axis and the NAAB SPC on the x axis. This matrix is to be completed in Excel and converted to Adobe PDF and the added to the final VTR.

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator
Norma Slarkek, FAIA
123 Anywhere Avenue
City, State 12345-0000
(123) 456-7890
email@email.com

Practitioner
Frank Lloyd Wright, AIA
123 Anywhere Avenue
City, State 12345-0000
(123) 456-7890
email@email.com

Student
Mary Louise Bethune, Assoc. AIA, LEED AP
123 Anywhere Avenue
City, State 12345-0000
(123) 456-7890
email@email.com

Nonvoting team member
Jane Doe
123 Anywhere Avenue
City, State 12345-0000
(123) 456-7890
email@email.com

V.   Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Norma Sklarek, FAIA   **Educator**
Team Chair

Frank Lloyd Wright, AIA   **Practitioner**
Team member

Mary Louise Bethune, Assoc. AIA, LEED AP   **Student**
Team member

Jane Doe   **Nonvoting team member**
Team Member

Name of University
School of Architecture

2016 Visiting Team Report (Initial or Continuation of Candidacy)

B. Arch

M. Arch

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
Date of Visit

Vision: The NAAB aspires to be the leader in establishing educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architectural profession.

Mission: The NAAB develops and maintains a system of accreditation in professional architecture education that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs.

Table of Contents

I.   Summary of Visit

      a.   Acknowledgements and Observations

      b.   Conditions Not Achieved (list number and title)

Not Met	Not Yet Met	In Progress	Not Applicable

II.   Progress on the Plan for Achieving Initial Accreditation

III.   Progress Since the Previous Site Visit

2004/9 Condition/Criterion [quoted in full] [NOTE: This section will be completed by the NAAB staff for each visit]

Previous Team Report (2010):

Previous FE Team Report (2013):

2016 Visiting Team Assessment:

III.   Compliance (or Plans for Compliance) with the Conditions for Accreditation

PART ONE (I): INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT AND COMMITMENT TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

This part addresses the commitment of the institution, its faculty, staff, and students to the development and evolution of the program over time.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 1 – IDENTITY & SELF-ASSESSMENT

I.1.1 History and Mission: The program must describe its history, mission and culture and how that history, mission, and culture shape the program's pedagogy and development.

- Programs that exist within a larger educational institution must also describe the history and mission of the institution and how that shapes or influences the program.

- The program must describe its active role and relationship within its academic context and university community. This includes the program's benefits to the institutional setting, and how the program as a unit and/or individual faculty members participate in university-wide initiatives and the university's academic plan. This also includes how the program as a unit develops multi-disciplinary relationships and leverage opportunities that are uniquely defined within the university and its local context in the surrounding community.

2016 Analysis/Review: Instructions to the team: write a brief summary of the program's history and mission based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. Limit: ½ page.

I.1.2 Learning Culture: The program must demonstrate that it provides a positive and respectful learning environment that encourages 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.

- The program must have adopted a written studio culture policy that also includes a plan for its implementation, including dissemination to all members of the learning community, regular evaluation, and continuous improvement or revision. In addition to the matters identified above, the plan must address the values of time management, general health and well-being, work-school-life balance, and professional conduct.

- The program must describe the ways in which students and faculty are encouraged to learn both inside and outside the classroom through individual and collective learning opportunities that include, but are not limited to field trips, participation in professional societies and organizations, honor societies, and other program-specific or campus-wide and community-wide activities.

2016 Analysis/Review: Instructions to the team: write a brief summary of the program's learning culture based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. Limit: ½ page.

I.1.3 Social Equity: The program must have a policy on diversity and inclusion that is communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff and is reflected in the distribution of the program's human, physical, and financial resources.

- The program must describe its plan for maintaining or increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students as compared with the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students of the institution during the next two accreditation cycles.

- The program must document that institutional, college or program-level policies are in place to further Equal Employment Opportunity/Affirmative Action (EEO/AA), as well as any other diversity initiatives at the program, college or institutional-level.

2016 Analysis/Review: Instructions to the team: write a brief summary of the program's learning culture based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. Limit: ½ page.

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

I.1.4 Defining Perspectives: The program must describe how it is responsive to the following perspectives or forces that impact the education and development of professional architects. . Each program is expected to address these perspectives consistently and to further identify, as part of its long-range planning activities, how these perspectives will continue to be addressed in the future.

A. **Collaboration and Leadership**. The program must describe its culture for successful individual and team dynamics, collaborative experiences and opportunities for leadership roles. Architects serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders.

B. **Design**. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates with an understanding of design as a multi-dimensional protocol for both problem resolution and the discovery of new opportunities that will create value. Graduates should be prepared to engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed to address increasingly complex problems, engage a diverse constituency, and provide value and an improved future.

C. **Professional Opportunity.** The program must describe its approach for educating students on the breadth of professional opportunity and career paths for architects in both traditional and non-traditional settings; in local and global communities.

D. **Stewardship of the Environment**. The program must describe its approach for developing graduates who are prepared to both understand and take responsibility for stewardship of the environmental and the natural resources that are significantly compromised by the act of building and constructed human settlements.

E. **Community and Social Responsibility**. The program must describe its approach to developing graduates who are prepared to be active, engaged citizens able to understand what it means to be a professional member of society and to act on that understanding. The social responsibility of architects lies in part in the belief that architects can create better places, and further that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program's response to social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to civic engagement to positively influence the development, conservation or changes to the built and natural environment

2016 Analysis/Review: Instructions to the team: write a brief summary of the program's learning culture based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. Limit: ½ page.

I.1.5 Long-Range Planning: The program must demonstrate that it has identified multi-year objectives for continuous improvement with a ratified planning document and / or planning process. . In addition, the program must demonstrate that data is collected routinely, and from multiple sources to identify patterns and trends, so as to inform its future planning and strategic decision-making. The program must describe how planning at the program level is part of larger strategic plans for the unit, college and university.

2016 Analysis/Review: Instructions to the team: write a brief summary of the program's learning culture based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. Limit: ½ page.

I.1.6 Assessment

A. **Program Self-Assessment Procedures**: The program must demonstrate that it regularly assesses the following:

- How well the program is progressing towards its mission and stated objectives.

- Progress against its defined multi-year objectives.

- Progress in addressing deficiencies and causes of concern identified at the time of the last visit.

- Strengths, challenges and opportunities faced by the program while continuously improving learning opportunities.

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

B. **Curricular Assessment and Development**: The program must demonstrate a well-reasoned process for curricular assessment and adjustments and must identify the roles and responsibilities of the personnel and committees involved in setting curricular agendas and initiatives including the curriculum committee, program coordinators, and department chairs or directors.

2016 Analysis/Review: Instructions to the team: write a brief summary of the program's learning culture based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. Limit: ½ page.

PART ONE (I): SECTION 2 – RESOURCES

I.2.1 Human Resources & Human Resource Development:

The program must demonstrate that it has 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.

- The program must demonstrate that it balances the workloads of all faculty to support a tutorial exchange between the student and teacher that promotes student achievement

- The program must demonstrate that an Intern Development Program (IDP) Educator Coordinator has been appointed, is trained in the issues of IDP, has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the IDP Educator Coordinator position description and, regularly attends IDP Coordinator training and development programs.

- The program must demonstrate that faculty and staff have opportunities to pursue professional development that contributes to program improvement.

- The program must describe the support services available to students in the program, including but not limited to academic and personal advising, career guidance, and internship or job placement.

[ ] Demonstrated

[ ] Not Demonstrated

[ ] In Progress

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

I.2.2 Physical Resources: The program must describe the physical resources available and how they support the pedagogical approach and student achievement.

Physical resources include, but are not limited to the following:

- Space to support and encourage studio-based learning.

- Space to support and encourage didactic and interactive learning including labs, shops, and equipment.

- Space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising.

- Information resources to support all learning formats and pedagogies in use by the program.

If the program's pedagogy does not require some or all of the above physical resources, for example, if online course delivery is employed to complement or supplement onsite learning, then the program must describe the effect (if any) that online, onsite, or hybrid formats have on digital and physical resources.

[ ] Demonstrated

[ ] Not Demonstrated

[ ] In Progress

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

I.2.3 Financial Resources: The program must demonstrate that it has appropriate financial resources to support student learning and achievement.

[ ] Demonstrated

[ ] Not Demonstrated

[ ] In Progress

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

I.2.4 Information Resources: The program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information, as well as appropriate visual, and digital resources that support professional education in the field of architecture.

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

[ ] Demonstrated

[ ] Not Demonstrated

[ ] In Progress

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

I.2.5 Administrative Structure & Governance:

- **Administrative Structure:** The program must describe its administrative structure, and identify key personnel, within the context of the program and school, college and institution.

- **Governance**: The program must describe the role of faculty, staff, and students in both program and institutional governance structures. The program must describe the relationship of these structures to the governance structures of the academic unit and the institution.

[ ] Demonstrated

[ ] Not Demonstrated

[ ] In Progress

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

This part has four sections that address the following:

- **STUDENT PERFORMANCE**. This section includes the Student Performance Criteria (SPC). Programs must demonstrate that graduates are learning at the level of achievement defined for each of the SPC listed in this part. Compliance will be evaluated through the review of student work

- **CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK**. This section addresses the program and institution relative to regional accreditation, degree nomenclature, credit hour requirements, general education and access to optional studies.

- **EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION**. The NAAB recognizes that students entering an accredited program from a preprofessional program and those entering an accredited program from a non-preprofessional degree program have different needs, aptitudes and knowledge bases. In this section, programs will be required to demonstrate the process by which incoming students are evaluated and to document that the SPC expected to have been met in educational experiences in non-accredited programs have indeed been met.

- **PUBLIC INFORMATION**. The NAAB expects accredited degree programs to provide information to the public regarding accreditation activities and the relationship between the program and the NAAB, admissions and advising, and career information, as well as accurate public information concerning the accredited and non-accredited architecture programs.

Programs demonstrate their compliance with Part Two in four ways:

- A narrative report that briefly responds to each request to "describe, document, or demonstrate."

- A review of evidence and artifacts by the visiting team, as well as through interviews and observations conducted during the visit.

- A review of student work that demonstrates student achievement of the SPC at the required level of learning.

- A review of websites, links, and other materials.

PART TWO (II): EDUCATIONAL OUTCOMES AND CURRICULUM

PART TWO (II): SECTION 1 – STUDENT PERFORMANCE -- EDUCATIONAL REALMS & STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

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

Instructions to the team:

1. *When an SPC is MET, the team is required to identify the course or courses where evidence of student accomplishment was found.*

2. *If an SPC is NOT MET, the team must include a narrative that indicates the reasoning behind the team's assessment.*

3. *If an SPC is NOT YET MET, the team must include a brief narrative that incidates that the programs has not yet deliverd the course(s) in which SPC are expected to be met by the time of initial accreditation.*

4. *After completing the VTR, the team must prepare an SPC matrix (using a blank provided by the program) that identifies the courses in which the team found the evidence of student achievement. The team's matrix is to be appended to the VTR as Appendix 2.*

Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to build abstract relationships and understand the impact of ideas based on the research and analysis of multiple theoretical, social, political, economic, cultural and environmental contexts. This includes using a diverse range of media to think about and convey architectural ideas including writing, investigative skills, speaking, drawing and model making.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Being broadly educated.

- Valuing lifelong inquisitiveness.

- Communicating graphically in a range of media.

- Assessing evidence.

- Comprehending people, place, and context.

- Recognizing the disparate needs of client, community, and society.

A.1   Professional Communication Skills: *Ability* to write and speak effectively and use appropriate representational media both with peers and with the general public.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

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

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

A.3   Investigative Skills : *Ability to* gather, assess, record, and comparatively evaluate relevant information and performance in order to support conclusions related to a specific project or assignment.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

A.4   Architectural Design Skills: *Ability to* effectively use basic formal, organizational and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

A.5   Ordering Systems: *Ability to apply* the fundamentals of both natural and formal ordering systems and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

A.6   Use of Precedents: *Ability* to examine and comprehend the fundamental principles present in relevant precedents and to make informed choices regarding the incorporation of such principles into architecture and urban design projects.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

A.7   History and Culture: *Understanding* of the parallel and divergent histories of architecture and the cultural norms of a variety of indigenous, vernacular, local, regional, settings in terms of their political, economic, social, and technological factors..

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

A.8   Cultural Diversity and Social Equity*: Understanding* of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, physical abilities, and social and spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals and the responsibility of the architect to ensure equity of access to buildings and structures.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

Realm A. General Team Commentary: [The team must provide a brief narrative that describes the overall review of student achievement in all elements of Realm D.]

Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to comprehend the technical aspects of design, systems and materials, and be able to apply that comprehension to architectural solutions. Additionally the impact of such decisions on the environment must be well considered.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Creating building designs with well-integrated systems.
- Comprehending constructability.
- Integrating the principles of environmental stewardship.
- Conveying technical information accurately

B.1   Pre-Design: *Ability* to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project, which must include an assessment of client and user needs, an inventory of spaces and their requirements, an analysis of site conditions (including existing buildings), a review of the relevant building codes and standards, including relevant sustainability requirements, and assessment of their implications for the project, and a definition of site selection and design assessment criteria.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.2   Site Design: *Ability* to respond to site characteristics including urban context and developmental patterning, historical fabric, soil, topography, climate, building orientation, and watershed in the development of a project design.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.3.   Codes and Regulations: *Ability* to design sites, facilities and systems consistent with the principles of life-safety standards, accessibility standards, and other codes and regulations.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

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

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.5   Structural Systems: *Ability to demonstrate* the basic principles of structural systems and their ability to withstand gravity, seismic, and lateral forces, as well as the selection and application of the appropriate structural system."

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.6   Environmental Systems: *Understanding* the principles of environmental systems' design, how systems can vary by geographic region, and the tools used for performance assessment. This must include active and passive heating and cooling, indoor air quality, solar systems, lighting systems, and acoustics.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.7   Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies: *Understanding* of the basic principles involved in the appropriate selection and application of building envelope systems relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.8   Building Materials and Assemblies: *Understanding* of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of interior and exterior construction materials, finishes, products, components and assemblies based on their inherent performance including environmental impact and reuse.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.9   Building Service Systems: *Understanding* of the basic principles and appropriate application and performance of building service systems including mechanical, plumbing, electrical, communication, vertical transportation security, and fire protection systems.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

B.10   Financial Considerations: *Understanding* of the fundamentals of building costs, which must include project financing methods and feasibility, construction cost estimating, construction scheduling, operational costs, and life-cycle costs.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

Realm B. General Team Commentary: [The team must provide a brief narrative that describes the overall review of student achievement in all elements of Realm D.]

Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions: Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must be able to synthesize a wide range of variables into an integrated design solution. This realm demonstrates the integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions.

Student learning aspirations in this realm include:

- Synthesizing variables from diverse and complex systems into an integrated architectural solution.

- Respond to environmental stewardship goals across multiple systems for an integrated solution.

- Evaluating options and reconciling the implications of design decisions across systems and scales.

C.1   Integrative Design: *Ability* to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

C.2   Evaluation and Decision Making: *Ability* to demonstrate the skills associated with making integrated decisions across multiple systems and variables in the completion of a design project. This includes problem identification, setting evaluative criteria, analyzing solutions, and predicting the effectiveness of implementation.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

Realm C. General Team Commentary: [The team must provide a brief narrative that describes the overall review of student achievement in all elements of Realm D.]

Realm D: Professional Practice. Graduates from NAAB-accredited programs must understand business principles for the practice of architecture, including management, advocacy, and acting legally, ethically and critically for the good of the client, society and the public.

Student learning aspirations for this realm include:

- Comprehending the business of architecture and construction..
- Discerning the valuable roles and key players in related disciplines.
- Understanding a professional code of ethics, as well as legal and professional responsibilities.

D.1   Stakeholder Roles In Architecture: *Understanding* of the relationship between the client, contractor, architect and other key stakeholders such as user groups and the community, in the design of the built environment. Understanding the responsibilities of the architect to reconcile the needs of those stakeholders

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

D.2   Project Management: *Understanding* of the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams, identifying work plans, project schedules and time requirements, and recommending project delivery methods.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

D.3   Business Practices: *Understanding* of the basic principles of business practices within the firm including financial management and business planning, marketing, business organization, and entrepreneurialism.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

D.5   Legal Responsibilities: *Understanding* the architect's responsibility to the public and the client as determined by regulations and legal considerations involving the practice of architecture and professional service contracts.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

D.6   Professional Ethics: *Understanding* of the ethical issues involved in the exercise of professional judgment in architectural design and practice, and understanding the role of the AIA Code of Ethics in defining professional conduct.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

2016 Team Assessment: Evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in work prepared for [couse(s) number(s) and title(s)].

Realm D. General Team Commentary: [The team must provide a brief narrative that describes the overall review of student achievement in all elements of Realm D.]

PART TWO (II): SECTION 2 – CURRICULAR FRAMEWORK

II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation:

In order for a professional degree program in architecture to be accredited by the NAAB, the institution must meet one of the following criteria:

1. The institution offering the accredited degree program must be or be part of an institution accredited by one of the following U.S. 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);

2. Institutions located outside the U.S. and not accredited by a U.S. regional accrediting agency, may request NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture only with explicit, written permission from all applicable national education authorities in that program's country or region. Such agencies must have a system of institutional quality assurance and review. Any institution in this category that is interested in seeking NAAB accreditation of a professional degree program in architecture must contact the NAAB for additional information.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.2.2 Professional Degrees and Curriculum: The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs with the following titles: 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 optional studies.

The B. Arch., M. Arch., and/or D. Arch. are titles used exclusively with NAAB-accredited professional degree programs.

Any institution that uses the degree title B. Arch., M. Arch, or D. Arch. for a non-accredited degree program must change the title. Programs must initiate the appropriate institutional processes for changing the titles of these non-accredited programs by June 30, 2018.

The number of credit hours for each degree is specified in the *Conditions*. Every accredited program must conform to the minimum credit hour requirements.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

PART TWO (II): SECTION 3 – EVALUATION OF PREPARATORY EDUCATION

The program must demonstrate that it has a thorough and equitable process to evaluate the preparatory or preprofessional education of individuals admitted to the NAAB-accredited degree program.

- Programs must document their processes for evaluating a student's prior academic coursework related to satisfying NAAB student performance criteria when a student is admitted to the professional degree program.

- In the event a program relies on the preparatory educational experience to ensure that admitted 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.

- The program must demonstrate that the evaluation of baccalaureate degree or associate degree content is clearly articulated in the admissions process, and that the evaluation process and its implications for the length of professional degree program can be understood by a candidate prior to accepting the offer of admission. See also, Condition II.4.6.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] In Progress

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

PART TWO (II): SECTION 4 – PUBLIC INFORMATION

The NAAB expects programs to be transparent and accountable in the information provided to students, faculty, and the general public. As a result, the following seven conditions require all NAAB-accredited programs to make certain information publicly available online. .

II.4.1 Statement on NAAB-Accredited Degrees

All institutions offering a NAAB-accredited degree program or any candidacy program must include the *exact language* found in the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*, Appendix 1 in catalogs and promotional media.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

[ ] Not Applicable

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures

The program must make the following documents electronically available to all students, faculty and the public:

> *The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*

> *The Conditions for Accreditation* in effect at the time of the last visit (2009 or 2004 depending on the date of the last visit)

> *The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation* (edition currently in effect)

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

[ ] Not Applicable

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

The program must demonstrate that students and graduates have access to career development and placement services that assist them in developing, evaluating, and implementing career, education, and employment plans.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

[ ] Not Applicable

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

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 electronically available to the public:

- All Interim Progress Reports (and narrative, Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012)

- All NAAB responses to Interim Progress Reports (and NAAB Responses to narrative Annual Reports submitted 2009-2012)

- The most recent decision letter from the NAAB

- The most recent *APR[1]*

- The final edition of the most recent *Visiting Team Report*, including attachments and addenda

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

[ ] Not Applicable

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

NCARB publishes pass rates for each section of the Architect Registration Examination by institution. This information is considered useful to prospective students as part of their planning for higher/post-secondary education in architecture. Therefore, programs are required to make this information available to current and prospective students and the public by linking their websites to the results.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

[ ] Not Applicable

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.4.6. Admissions and Advising

The program must publicly document all policies and procedures that govern how applicants to the accredited program are evaluated for admission. These procedures must include first-time, first-year students as well as transfers within and outside the institution.

This documentation must include the following:

- Application forms and instructions

- Admissions requirements, admissions decisions procedures, including policies and processes for evaluation of transcripts and portfolios (where required), and decisions regarding remediation, and advanced standing

- Forms and process for the evaluation of pre-professional degree content

- Requirements and forms for applying for financial aid and scholarships

- Student diversity initiatives.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

---

[1] This is understood to be the APR from the previous visit, not the APR for the visit currently in process.

[ ] Not Yet Met

[ ] Not Applicable

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

II.4.7 Student Financial Information

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to information and advice for making decisions regarding financial aid.

- The program must demonstrate that students have access to an initial estimate for all tuition, fees, books, general supplies, and specialized materials that may be required during the full course of study for completing the NAAB-accredited degree program.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

[ ] Not Yet Met

[ ] Not Applicable

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

PART THREE (III): – ANNUAL AND INTERIM REPORTS

III.1 Annual Statistical Reports: The program is required to submit annual statistical reports in the format required by the NAAB Procedures.

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.

[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

III.2 Interim Progress Reports. The program must submit interim progress reports to the NAAB (See Section 11, *NAAB Procedures for Accreditation,* 2012 Edition, Amended*).*
[ ] Met

[ ] Not Met

2016 Team Assessment: [NOTE: This commentary/assessment must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment.]

IV. Appendices:

Appendix 1. Conditions Met with Distinction

(list number and title; include comments that describe the basis for the team's assessment)

Appendix 2. Team SPC Matrix

The team is required to complete an SPC matrix that identifies the course(s) in which student work demonstrated the program's compliance with Part II. Section 1.

The program is required to provide the team with a blank matrix that identifies courses by number and title on the y axis and the NAAB SPC on the x axis. This matrix is to be completed in Excel and converted to Adobe PDF and the added to the final VTR.

Appendix 3. The Visiting Team

Team Chair, Educator
Norma Slarkek, FAIA
123 Anywhere Avenue
City, State 12345-0000
(123) 456-7890
email@email.com

Practitioner
Frank Lloyd Wright, AIA
123 Anywhere Avenue
City, State 12345-0000
(123) 456-7890
email@email.com

Student
Mary Louise Bethune, Assoc. AIA, LEED AP
123 Anywhere Avenue
City, State 12345-0000
(123) 456-7890
email@email.com

Nonvoting team member
Jane Doe
123 Anywhere Avenue
City, State 12345-0000
(123) 456-7890
email@email.com

V.   Report Signatures

Respectfully Submitted,

Norma Sklarek, FAIA **Team Chair**	**Educator**

Frank Lloyd Wright, AIA **Team member**	**Practitioner**

Mary Louise Bethune, Assoc. AIA, LEED AP **Team member**	**Student**

Jane Doe **Team Member**	**Nonvoting team member**

Confidential Recommendation

Upon consideration of the terms of accreditation in Section 3 of the *2015 NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*, including an assessment of compliance with the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*, the team unanimously recommends to the NAAB Directors:

Institution, Academic/Administrative Unit:

Degree Title (include prerequisites and number of credits required):

☐ Eight-year term of accreditation

☐ Four-year term of accreditation

☐ Two-year probationary term of accreditation

☐ Revocation of accreditation

☐ Initial candidacy

☐ Continuation of Candidacy

☐ Initial Accreditation (three years beginning January 1 of the year in which the visit took place)

Norma Sklarek, FAIA
Team Chair

Frank Lloyd Wright, AIA
Team member

Thomas Jefferson, AIA
Team member

Mary Louise Bethune, Assoc. AIA
Team member

The template for Substantive Change Reports is under development

Appendix 4: Branch Campus Questionnaire

Name of institution:	
Title of degree:	
Name of program administrator:	
Name of person completing this form:	
Location of branch campus, additional site, teaching site, online learning, or study abroad program:	
Distance from main/flagship campus:	
Number of courses from curriculum leading to a NAAB-accredited degree offered at this site	
(List all courses: number, title, credits offered)	
Is attendance at the branch campus, additional site, teaching site, study abroad program, or online program required for completion of the NAAB-accredited degree program?	
Who has administrative responsibility for the program at the branch campus?	
To whom does this individual report?	
Where are financial decisions made?	
Who has responsibility for hiring faculty?	
Who has responsibility for rank, tenure, and promotion of faculty at the branch campus?	
Does the branch campus have its own curriculum committee?	
Does the branch campus have its own admissions committee?	
Does the branch campus have its own grievance committee?	

Does the branch campus have its own resources for faculty research and scholarship?	
Does the branch campus have its own AIAS or NOMAS chapter?	
Does the branch campus maintain its own membership in ACSA?	

Appendix 5: Reimbursement Policy

The program is responsible for all expenses for visiting teams. This includes visits for continuing accreditation, eligibility for candidacy, initial candidacy, continuation of candidacy, initial accreditation, and substantive changes.

All programs will be invoiced by the NAAB for all team travel expenses after team members are reimbursed by the NAAB.

The program is responsible for notifying the NAAB staff not less than 30 days prior to the visit if there are visit-related expenses that cannot be reimbursed according to institution policy.

The NAAB reimburses each team member for expenses related to a site visit. This includes visits for continuing accreditation, eligibility for candidacy, initial candidacy, continuation of candidacy, initial accreditation, and substantive changes.

The NAAB subsequently invoices the program for these expenses. Reimbursable expenses are expenses for hotel and subsistence and local travel to and from the airport and during the visit, expenses incurred in planning the visit or preparing the report, as well as expenses for parking, tips, and food en route. The program is directly responsible for expenses incurred by its nominated non-voting member. If it wishes, the program may provide direct hotel, subsistence, and other team necessities on site; such expenses are not reported to the NAAB by team members and are not reimbursed by the NAAB or invoiced to the program by the NAAB.

Immediately following the visit, team members and NAAB non-voting members must complete a reimbursement form (available online) and submit original receipts for transportation, meals, hotel, and miscellaneous expenses to the NAAB office.

The NAAB will not reimburse team members for alcoholic beverages, personal items, cleaning, laundry, or entertainment.

Reimbursement for air travel is for economy coach class only and only for the dates of the visit; car rental requires prior approval from the program. The program's non-voting member should make arrangements for reimbursement directly with the program.

All reimbursements should be submitted to the NAAB office within 30 days of the visit. Please submit expenses for reimbursement only when you can include original receipts. Attach the receipts for all expenses (except mileage) to the form. Requests for reimbursement submitted more than 30 days after a visit ends must be reviewed by the NAAB executive committee before being processed.

When you have filled out the expense reimbursement form, please send it to:

Ms. Ziti Sherman
Director, Finance and Administration
NAAB
zsherman@naab.org
1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036

Appendix 6: List of Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACSA	Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture
AIA	The American Institute of Architects
AIAS	The American Institute of Architecture Students
APR	Architecture Program Report
APR-IC	Architecture Program Report for Initial Candidacy
APR-IA	Architecture Program Report for Initial Accreditation
ARE	Architect Registration Examination
FERPA	Federal Educational Records Privacy Act
IDP	Intern Development Program
NAAB	National Architectural Accrediting Board
NCARB	National Council of Architectural Registration Boards
NVTM	Non-Voting Team Member
SPC	Student Performance Criterion or Student Performance Criteria
VTR	Visiting Team Report
VTR-IC	Visiting Team Report for Initial Candidacy
VTR-IA	Visiting Team Report for Initial Accreditation

INDEX

Handbook for 2017 Visits

The National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

NAAB®

1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036
202.783.2007
www.naab.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

This handbook is prepared by the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) for program administrators and visiting teams for visits conducted in calendar 2017. The handbook has two purposes:

- To supplement the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* and *2015 Procedures for Accreditation*, by providing advice designed to continually improve the level of consistency in the accreditation process for all professional programs accredited by the NAAB.

- To serve as a guide for all the participants in the visit process to use in organizing and conducting an accreditation visit during the 2017 visit cycle.

The NAAB welcomes your comments and suggestions for ways to improve this document. Please send your suggestions to forum@naab.org.

What is the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB)?

The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) was founded in 1940, to "produce and maintain current a list of accredited programs of architecture in the United States and its possessions, with the general objective that a well-integrated and coordinated program of architectural education be developed that is national in scope and afford opportunity for architectural programs with varying resources and operating conditions to find places appropriate to their objectives and do high class work therein."

> "The … societies creating this accrediting board, here record their intent not to create conditions, nor to have conditions created, that will tend toward standardization of educational philosophies or practices, but rather to create and maintain conditions that will encourage the development of practices suited to the conditions which are special to the individual school. The accrediting board must be guided by this intent." (from the 1940 Founding Agreement)

Since 1975, the *NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* have emphasized self-assessment and student performance as central elements of the NAAB model. The Directors have maintained their commitment to both of these as core tenets of the NAAB's criteria and procedures.

NAAB's Vision: The NAAB aspires to be the leader in establishing educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architectural profession.

NAAB's Mission: The NAAB develops and maintains a system of accreditation in professional architecture education that is responsive to the needs of society and allows institutions with varying resources and circumstances to evolve according to their individual needs.

NAAB's Values: The following principles serve as a guide and inspiration to the NAAB.

1. ***Shared Responsibility.*** The education of an architect is a responsibility shared by the academy and the profession in trust for the broader society and the public good.

2. ***Best Practices.*** The NAAB's accreditation processes are based on best practices in professional and specialized accreditation.

3. ***Program Accountability.*** Architecture degree programs are accountable for the learning of their students. Thus, accreditation by the NAAB is based both on educational outcomes and institutional commitment to continuous improvement.

4. ***Preparing Graduates for Practice.*** A NAAB-accredited degree prepares students to live and work in a diverse world: to think critically; to make informed decisions; to communicate effectively; to engage in life-long learning; and to exercise the unique knowledge and skills required to work and develop as professionals. Graduates are prepared for architectural internship, set on the pathway to examination and licensure, and to engage in related fields.

5. ***Constant Conditions for Diverse Contexts.*** *The NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* are broadly defined and achievement-oriented so that programs may meet these standards within the framework of their mission and vision, allowing for initiative and innovation. This imposes conditions on both the NAAB and on architectural programs. The NAAB assumes the responsibility for undertaking a fair, thorough, and holistic evaluation

process, relying essentially on the program's ability to demonstrate how within their institutional context they meet all evaluative criteria. The process relies on evaluation and judgment that, being rendered on the basis of qualitative factors, may defy precise substantiation.

6. ***Continuous Improvement through Regular Review.*** *The NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* are developed through an iterative process that acknowledges and values the contributions of educators, professionals in traditional and non-traditional practice, and students. The NAAB regularly convenes conversations on critical issues (e.g. studio culture) and challenges the other four collateral partners to acknowledge and respect the perspectives of the others.

What is Accreditation?

Accreditation is a voluntary, quality assurance process under which services and operations are evaluated by a third party against a set of standards set by the third-party with input and collaboration from peers within the field. Voluntary accreditation is distinguished by five components:

- It is provided through private agencies

- It requires a significant degree of self-evaluation by the institution or program, the results of which are summarized in a report to the agency

- A team conducts a visit

- Recommendations or judgments about accreditation are made by expert and trained peers

- Institutions have the opportunity to respond to most steps in the process

What is Accreditation in Architecture Education?

Accreditation is the primary means by which degree programs demonstrate quality to students and the public.

Accredited status is a signal that a professional degree program meets established standards for student learning, resources, facilities, student services, and public information.

Setting the Context for NAAB Visits and Visiting Teams

It is the expectation of the NAAB, and the public, that each accredited professional degree program in architecture satisfies the NAAB's conditions for accreditation.

The extent to which the conditions are satisfied, and the manner in which they have been satisfied, will vary among programs. Visiting teams are expected to respect the differences between programs in terms of pedagogy, curriculum design, teaching methodologies, and assessment practices.

Visiting teams will review student work that represents both outstanding performance and minimal achievement.

The public expectations for accredited degree programs in architecture have specific importance, since a majority of U.S. jurisdictions have made a NAAB-accredited professional degree a requirement for licensure. Although achieving licensure is not, and cannot be, the primary concern of the NAAB, it is our responsibility to verify, to the degree possible, that standards are being met by all students from all programs at the time of graduation.

The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and *The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation,* 2015 Edition, are two separate documents. They serve as the fundamental specifications for the accreditation process. References made in this handbook to the "*Cs* & *Ps"*, unless otherwise noted, represent the current adopted editions of these documents. This handbook serves as a guide to team chairs and visiting team members rather than as a statement of NAAB policy.

It is assumed that the reader is familiar with the latest editions of the *Conditions* and *Procedures* and understands the following:

- The *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.*

- The procedures to be followed before, during, and following a visit. See especially
    - Section 2. General Information
    - Section 3. Terms of Accreditation
    - Section 4. Candidacy and Initial Accreditation
    - Section 5. Continuing Accreditation
    - Section 7. Special Circumstances
    - Section 8. Conflicts of Interest
- The purpose and organization of the *Visiting Team Report* (VTR)

If a program administrator, team chair, or team member has questions or wishes to consult with the NAAB's executive director or director, accreditation before, during, or after the visit, please feel free to call the NAAB at 202.783.2007. After hours and on the weekend, these individuals are available by email and text.

Core Documents for Accreditation by the NAAB

The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation and *The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*, 2015 Edition, are the accreditation documents currently in effect for accreditation actions by the National Architectural Accrediting Board beginning in January 2016.

This handbook is considered advisory and therefore is not identified either in the NAAB's Bylaws or *Rules of the Board,* as an official document of the NAAB. Thus, on matters of policy or procedure, these two documents supersede all information in this handbook.

Basic Principles

There are several basic principles that are central to the NAAB's purposes and process. These are explained in detail throughout this document and are summarized below:

1. Teams have five tools with which to work during the visit:
    a. *The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation*
    b. *The NAAB Procedures for Accreditation*, 2015 Edition
    c. The program's *Architecture Program Report*
    d. The team room (i.e. evidence of student work and curricular materials)
    e. Meetings with individuals and groups conducted during the course of the visit.

The team must understand the purposes of each element and the differences between them.

2. It is the NAAB's responsibility to verify, to the degree possible, that standards are being met by all students from all programs <u>at the time of graduation</u>.

3. Although accredited education is a central element for becoming registered to practice architecture independently, the primary concern of the NAAB is to determine through a peer-review process whether a professional degree in architecture meets the Conditions established by the NAAB.

4. Program administrators and team members must understand the difference between the two levels of achievement for the SPC: understanding and ability.

5. Outstanding aspects of programmatic compliance with the *Conditions* or student performance criteria (SPC) cannot override significant deficiencies in some other aspect.

In this section, we will describe the team, how teams are formed, and the responsibilities of the team chair.

Composition of Teams

The composition of visiting teams depends on the type of visit to be conducted. See Sections 4 and 5 of the 2015 Procedures for additional information.

Sequence for Forming Visiting Teams

Once dates are set for visits, the NAAB office reviews resumes and availability forms for all individuals eligible to serve on visiting teams and make preliminary assignments.

Team members are then advised to "save the date," with the understanding that the program must confirm the membership of the team before a team's composition is considered "final."

Teams are then proposed to the program administrators. Team members may be challenged on the basis of the NAAB's Conflict of Interest (See Section 8 of the *2015 Procedures*, Amended.)

Subsequent changes in teams are coordinated by the NAAB executive director and the NAAB accreditation manager, with the approval of the visiting team chair, and the program administrator.

Team Chairs

The team chair is the designated leader of a NAAB visiting team. He/she has responsibilities prior to, during, and after the site visit. The team chair will have originally been nominated to serve as a team member by ACSA, or AIA or NCARB.

Individuals who have completed at least three site visits, and received positive evaluations on each of these visits, are included in the pool of potential team chairs. Visiting team chairs may also be nominated from among former directors of the NAAB. Individuals may remain in the pool of potential team chairs as long as they continue to receive positive evaluations.

Visiting team chairs are nominated by the staff from among the pool of potential team chairs and approved by the executive committee. The nomination is based on a review of the resumes of current visiting team chairs and experienced visiting team members, team member evaluations, and evaluations of VTR quality. Every effort is made to avoid conflicts of interest in making nominations and to ensure the team chairs represent a diverse group of individuals.

Once a team chair is approved by the executive committee, the NAAB staff notify the program administrator that an individual has been nominated. The administrator may challenge the nomination for potential conflicts of interest (see Section 8, *2015 Procedures for Accreditation*). Once the chair has been confirmed, the administrator and the chair work together to select a date for the visit. In addition, after a team chair is confirmed, he/she is required to attend team chair training in the fall prior to the spring visit cycle.

Upon the program's acceptance of the team chair, NAAB staff informs the team chair of her/his selection. Upon agreeing to serve, the team chair is in charge throughout the visit process, including visit preparation, conduct of the visit, and visit follow up. The team chair should immediately contact the program head to initiate a cooperative working relationship, address the ground rules for the visit, and the nomination process for non-voting team members.

Once the visiting team has been formed and approved, the team chair is encouraged to contact each team member, either individually or via conference call, to discuss planning and assignments in advance of the visit. In addition, all teams must hold at least two pre-visit conference calls.

Non-voting Team Members

To facilitate communication and foster a spirit of collaboration, the program is encouraged to nominate one non-voting team member for the site visit.

The nominations are approved by the executive director in consultation with the team chair. Nominations must be accompanied by a resume or vitae and a brief description of the relationship between the individual and the program.

See Section 5 of the *2015 Procedures* for additional information.

All non-voting members must agree in advance to abide by the principles of confidentiality as outlined in this document and by the Conflict of Interest policies in Section 8 of the *2015 Procedures*.

Before the Visit

Once a team has been approved by the program, the members are notified and should make travel arrangements. Team members should expect to arrive in time to begin work based on the schedule set by the team chair and program administrator.

Team members are also expected to use the time prior to the visit to review the *2014 Conditions* and *2015 Procedures.* Sixty days before the visit is scheduled to begin, each team member will receive a copy of the *Architecture Program Report (APR,* see p. 12) directly from the program.

All team members are expected to read the *APR* at least twice prior to arriving on site and to develop a list of questions and discussion items that will form the basis of the team's first pre-visit conference call.

All teams are required to participate in two, mandatory, pre-visit conference calls.

- **Team Conference Call #1**. Team members and non-voting members participate in a mandatory pre-visit conference call 30 days prior to the visit. During the call, the visiting team reviews the *APR, Conditions*, and *Procedures*, discusses visit protocols, and establishes expectations for how the team will work. Travel plans (arrivals/departures, hotel information, ground transportation) are also reviewed at this time. Team members discuss their initial reactions to the *APR*, raise any initial concerns, and identify and prioritize the questions to be addressed during the documentary review (see below) and later, during the visit.

- **Team Conference Call #2**. Team members participate in a second, mandatory pre-visit conference call 14 days before the visit. During this call, the team reviews the results of the documentary review (see below), identify missing materials or documents, prepares questions to be addressed during the visit, and identifies any other areas of inquiry. At this time, the visiting team chair outlines team assignments and may revise details of the agenda.

- **Documentary Review**. This is a review of reports, tables, and other documentary material prepared and presented in support of the program's compliance with the following *Conditions:*

    a. Administrative Structure

    b. Governance

    c. Social Equity

    d. Learning Culture

    e. Long-Range Planning

    f. Assessment

    g. Human Resources and Human Resources Development

    h. Financial Resources (to the extent possible)[1]

    i. Information Resources

---

[1] The program administrator and the team chair will agree on matters of content and format for financial information. Team members are reminded that financial information may be considered sensitive and confidential by the program or the institution. This is especially true for private institutions.

j. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

k. Public Information

l. Annual Statistical Reports

m. Interim Progress Reports

This material is to be presented either in PDFs or other online format and made available to the team not less than 30 days prior to the visit. Most of this material is available through links in the APR.

During the Visit

Visits typically last four days, with the bulk of the time spent reviewing student work, meeting with individuals and groups, and preparing the draft *VTR*. This is a very short time in which to comprehend the full nature of a program. To assure an understanding of a program's unique educational structure and mission, as well as result in an informed evaluation and recommendation, visiting teams must prepare themselves well in advance of the visit.

This preparation includes reading the *APR*, participating in two, mandatory pre-visit conference calls, and reviewing the *2014 Conditions for Accreditation* and the *2015 Procedures for Accreditation*.

Under certain circumstances a visit may be extended or shortened. These are outlined in the *Procedures* (see Section 7).

The Visit Agenda

The visit agenda is described in Section 5 of the *Procedures.* The program administrator and the team chair work together to develop the specific itinerary for the visit.

All visiting team members, including the non-voting team member, are expected to be present for the entire visit.

Team chairs are encouraged to preserve as much of the agenda as possible for the team to work in the team room.

Typical elements of the site visit agenda include:

- Large blocks of time for the team to work alone (60 minutes or more each)
    - o Review of student work, course materials,
    - o Debrief meetings,
    - o Review admissions and advising files
    - o Draft the *VTR*
- Shorter periods of time (15-60 minutes each)
    - o Tour of the facilities
    - o Entrance meetings with the program or college administrators, faculty and students
    - o Meetings with student representatives
    - o Meeting with library and information resources staff
    - o Exit meetings with the program or college administrators, the chief academic officer of the institution, faculty, staff, and students

- Review of a faculty exhibit (optional)
- Contact with alumnae/alumni and local practitioners (optional)

In setting the visit agenda, the team chair should:

- Maintain some flexibility and expect disruptions
- Allow adequate time to visit additional teaching sites
- Account for fatigue –"a tired team is an unproductive team."

The afternoon of the last day on campus should be cleared of meetings and other activities so that the team can work on the *VTR*.

Meetings

During the course of the visit, the team will meet with a number of groups and individuals. Team members are advised to prepare a list of questions about individual Conditions and to ask them during these meetings. The following list of meetings includes suggested topics. This list is by no means exhaustive, and it is provided only to aid administrators and teams in planning.

- Chief Academic Officer (e.g., the provost)
    - Role and purpose of the NAAB visit
    - Administrative structure
    - Resources
    - Challenges facing the institution
- Head of the academic unit in which the program is located (e.g., dean or department head)
    - Resources
    - Challenges facing the program
    - Faculty professional development
    - Curriculum review and development
- Program administrator – the team should be prepared to discuss all of the Conditions with this individual
- Faculty
    - Tenure
    - Professional Development
    - Curriculum review and development
    - Governance
    - Learning Culture, including Studio Culture
    - Social Equity
    - Architect Licensing Advisor(s)
- Staff
    - Professional Development
    - Resources

- o Governance
- o Social Equity
- Students
  - o Learning Culture
  - o Studio Culture
  - o Social Equity
  - o AXP (formerly IDP)
  - o Challenges or concerns

Meetings with alumni and local practitioners are optional. Sometimes they are scheduled as social events. If a meeting is scheduled with this group, the team is advised to use the time as an informal opportunity to gain additional information and a better understanding of the program.

Finalizing the Visit Agenda

The deadline for finalizing the visit agenda is six weeks in advance of the visit; although this is not always possible. The team chair has final authority in setting the agenda. It is not necessary to send a copy of the visit schedule to the NAAB office; the agenda is not required for the *VTR.*

What to Say in Exit Interviews

Exit interviews can be challenging especially with senior institutional administrators who may want to ask questions of the team.

First, if the VTR is substantially complete prior to the exit interviews, team members may depart early.

Exit interviews led by the team chair. He/she is the only team member required to remain for the exit interviews. However, it may be helpful if there is at least one educator participating in the exit interviews.

Based on feedback from experienced team chairs, the NAAB recommends that during each exit interview, the team chair read, *verbatim*, the following sections of the draft *VTR:*

    Part I

        Section 1 – Observations and Acknowledgements

        Section 2 – Conditions Not Met/Not-Yet Met

    Part III (Optional)

        Appendix 1 – Conditions Met with Distinction

This practice eliminates any subtle differences between the different exit interviews and ensures that all audiences receive the same message.

All questions should be answered by the team chair.

Throughout the exit interviews, it is very important to resist the impulse to

- Give advice or suggestions about how to improve the program or respond to any deficiencies (e.g., "You might think about changing the content of the pro practice class…") or

- Speak extemporaneously after reading the text of the *VTR* (e.g., "What we mean is…")

In the final interview, with the program's faculty, staff, and students:

- It is appropriate to say thank you and to acknowledge the program's effort to prepare for and host the visit.

- The chair may invite other team members, if they stay, to add a personal, positive observation that ties in to thanks for the efforts made by the program for the visit (e.g., "I really appreciated the way student work was displayed throughout the building, and I hope you encourage students and faculty from other disciplines to visit while the displays are still up....etc., etc.).

- Under no condition should such comments express negative conclusions, "minority opinions" or otherwise qualify or editorialize what has been read in the official comments.

Finally, please remember that under no circumstances is the team to reveal its recommendation. This is confidential in perpetuity. To the extent possible, it should not be revealed to the NVTM either.

After the Visit

Once the visit ends, the team chair is responsible for completing the draft VTR and submitting it to the office. Team members are advised to be available to the chair for consultation and/or to review the final draft.

Once you have returned home, please be sure to submit your reimbursement request quickly. There is additional information about reimbursements on page 31.

In this section of the handbook, we introduce some of the key elements of every visit. These include the Architecture Program Report (APR), the team room, and the Visiting Team Report (VTR).

Architecture Program Report (APR)

The *APR* is the document in which the program presents itself to the team.

This includes not only describing the mission, vision, and history of the institution and the program it also serves as the program's comprehensive, reflective self-study relative to the *Conditions for Accreditation.*

Teams should review this report carefully and frequently. The *APR* forms the basis for the visiting team to prepare for the site visit and evaluate evidence during the visit.

Finally, the APR may be used to aid the team in offering informed observations at the end of the visit. It may also be reviewed by the NAAB Directors while making a decision on a term of accreditation.

Each team member receives a copy of the *APR* directly from the program 60 days prior to the visit. These are sent electronically.

The *APR* is reviewed by the team chair after it has been received by the NAAB. The purpose of the review is to determine the clarity and completeness of the *APR*, and to discern the complexity of the program's structure. The *APR* review does not assess the quality of the program.

The Team Room

The characteristics of the team room are described in the *Procedures* Section 5.

Its purpose is to provide the team with a secure, reasonably soundproof work space in order to review and discuss the program's documentation in confidence.

The room must contain fully labeled and easily accessible samples of student work. Exhibits must include examples of both the minimum passing assessment and high achievement; be of sufficient quantity to demonstrate that all graduates are meeting the performance criteria; have been executed since the previous site visit; and span no less than two previous academic years.

The team room should also be equipped with:

- a way for the team to work together
- a way to for the team to work collaboratively in large format
- a way for the team to review work presented in digital format
- Internet access

Display of Student Work

To the extent possible, student work presented as evidence of student outcomes should be displayed only in the team room because (1) student work used by the visiting team must include indications of high and low grades, and (2) the team needs privacy for confidential discussions of the work being presented.

It is possible and appropriate to display representative pieces in the team room that can be verified against work that is displayed elsewhere. Any time student work must be displayed outside the confines of the team room, the program must provide an inconspicuous and confidential coding system to differentiate between the high and low pass work.

Under some circumstances, programs may wish to use the accreditation visit as an opportunity to celebrate the program. The team room does not serve this purpose. Any public display should be curated and made available after the visit concludes. Any student work on display outside the team room, and not explicitly designated as work submitted for review by the team, is not used as evidence for determining whether a particular SPC is met.

Digital Team Rooms

The NAAB encourages, but does not require, the use of digital presentations of student work. Some programs may choose to present all work in digital format, others may use both digital and analog forms; still others may present all the work in hard copy. The NAAB has established guidelines for using digital format for 2017. These include:

A standard file structure based on SPC.

📁 SPC Number (E.g., B.3)

📁 Course Number & Title (e.g., ARCH 210)

📁 Item (use consistent identifiers e.g., "Spring 2016_Min Achieve)

Viewers must be able to enlarge or zoom into sections of the file

Programs may also choose to present course notebooks in digital format in advance of the visit. These can be available either by USB drive or on a digital portal like Dropbox or Google Docs or through a site set up by the school.

Teams and team chairs are advised to be open to the format(s) suggested by the program.

The Visiting Team Report (VTR)

The *Visiting Team Report* is the only artifact of the visit.

It is the culmination of the team's analysis and review, and transmits the team's findings to the board, which in turn must make a decision on a term of accreditation.

The VTR addresses all of the Conditions. It must be concise and consistent.

VTRs must not include advice to the program about whether or how to address deficiencies.

The team is provided with a template for the *VTR*. A unique template is prepared for each visit and includes the relevant sections for the individual program including the signature pages.

Remember the Reader

The most important readers of any *VTR* are the NAAB directors. The report must convey to them, in the clearest, simplest language the assessment of the visiting team for each Condition and SPC and then provide an assessment of the program overall. A sample *VTR* template can be found in Appendix 2 of the *2015 Procedures.*

The VTR is the only resource the NAAB directors have to ensure their understanding of the team's recommendation on a term of accreditation. When the contents of the *VTR* do not clearly and succinctly support the recommendation or are vague or poorly written, the Board is faced with the difficult task of attempting to recreate the team's logic. *VTRs* that are vague or inconsistent result in lengthy deliberations and, sometimes, a decision not fully represented by the *VTR.* The following areas are of the greatest interest to the Board:

- Acknowledgements and Observation

- Progress Since the Previous Visit

- Conditions Not Met

- Comments that follow an initial Met/Not Met assessment of each Condition or SPC

Consistency is critical.

Editorial commentary or recommendations are not helpful.

Teams are advised to be certain that deficiencies noted in one part of the report are not later noted as areas of distinction in another part of the report. Likewise, the recommendation for a term of accreditation should be consistent with the overall results of the visit.

In the event that teams encounter inconsistencies during a visit, for example one group cites something as a problem, while another group sees the same item as a strength, then the team should document this disparity in the report.

Be sure to define all acronyms the first time they appear in the text. For example, everyone on the campus of the program you visited may know that SOAP stands for the School of Architecture and Planning, but your reader does not.

All draft *VTR*s are reviewed by the NAAB staff for punctuation, format, spelling, and clarity. If the staff believes the report contains unclear language, is prescriptive, or indicates a lack of consistency between assessments and team comments and the recommendation, the report will be returned to the chair for additional editing and revisions.

VTR Format and Instructions

Cover Page

On the cover page of the report, list all the degree programs covered by the report. Include the following for each degree program or track for completing the accredited degree program:

Degree Title (prerequisite(s); number of credits for completion)

For example:

Bachelor of Architecture (159 credits)

Master of Architecture (preprofessional degree + 60 graduate credits)

Master of Architecture (non-preprofessional degree + 90 graduate credits)

Part I – Summary of the Visit

First, the Acknowledgements and Observations (VTR, Part I, Section 1), should be written last, after the rest of the report has been completed.

This section has three parts:

▸ Acknowledging the program for the effort expended on the visit and the team room

▸ A brief (200-word) objective overview of the program's successes, innovations, or assets. This may also include a summary of the team's findings overall and identify, in general terms, the state of the program as the visiting team finds it.

▸ A brief (200-word) objective overview of the program's deficiencies **relative to the Conditions.** In this section, the team may also identify any areas beyond the program's control that may have affected the visit (e.g., budget cuts during

the recession, construction projects that are behind schedule, or illness/unavailability of certain personnel).

NOTE: this is not an opportunity to insert "Causes of Concern" back into the report – it is a summary of what was not demonstrated, not defined, not described, or not met.

Finally, avoid using the following phrases, as they are over-used and not given serious consideration:

- The program has improved since the last visit, however…

- The students were all enthusiastic, committed, and excited by the program (or words to that effect).

Conditions Not Met

This should be a list of Conditions or SPC with numbers and titles.

For example,

I.2 Social Equity

II.1.C.3 Comprehensive Design

Part II - Progress Since the Previous Visit

The NAAB directors take a keen interest in this section of the *VTR*, especially if there were deficiencies in Conditions or SPC at the time of the previous visit that remain a deficiency at the conclusion of the current visit. The NAAB staff will include the relevant sections in the template. Please follow the format for the written response to each one, as follows:

2009 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 (2011): *Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipisicing elit, sed do eiusmod tempor incididunt ut labore et dolore magna aliqua. Ut enim ad minim veniam, quis nostrud exercitation ullamco laboris nisi ut aliquip ex ea commodo consequat.*

> **2017 Visiting Team Assessment:** *Excepteur sint occaecat cupidatat non proident, sunt in culpa qui officia deserunt mollit anim id est laborum.*

NOTE 1: The template for this section of the report will include the 2009 numbers.

NOTE 2: If the program underwent a focused evaluation, the results of that assessment also will be included in this section of the *VTR.*

Part III - Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

Writing the Summaries for Conditions I.1.1-I.1.6

First and foremost, this section is a report; **it is not an assessment**.

This section of the VTR provides the team with the opportunity to do two things:

- Introduce the program to the Board
- Demonstrate their understanding of these six areas relative to the program under review

Teams are asked to summarize

- a program's history and mission
- the learning culture
- policies and programs related to social equity
- the program's approach(es) to the five perspectives
- the program's long-range planning
- the program's self-assessment

Writing the Section on Conditions I.2.1-I.2.5

Again, teams are not assessing whether a program's resources are good, bad, or indifferent, the team is confirming that the program has demonstrated or described its resources in support of student learning.

Writing the Section on Conditions II.1-II.4.7

In this section, teams are making a determination that the program has or has not met a Condition for Accreditation.

Part IV – Appendices 1 and 2

Appendices 1 and 2 are completed by the team.

Appendix 1 is Conditions Met with Distinction.

This should be an enumerated list with both the number and title of the SPC for which the team wishes to cite the program as having demonstrated significant success, innovation, or achievement. Please include a brief statement of the team's rationale for citing each SPC.

For example,

- I.1.2 Social Equity and Learning Culture
- II.1.A.11 Applied Research
- II.1.B.9 Structural Systems
- II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development

Appendix 2 is the team SPC matrix. The program must provide the team with a blank SPC matrix that shows the SPC and the course numbers. The team must fill out the matrix identifying the course where the evidence was found by the team.

Part VI – Signature Page

On the last page of the report, all team members sign and submit the report to the Board. This page is signed by all members of the team including the non-voting member.

The Confidential Recommendation

The confidential recommendation is a separate document submitted by the team at the same time as the *VTR.* It is advisory, nonbinding on the board, and confidential in perpetuity.

It is signed only by the members of the team and must not include the signature of the non-voting member.

The recommendation is absolutely confidential. It should not be shared with anyone, including the non-voting team member, spouses, colleagues, or anyone else for that matter. The NAAB has determined that this document will remain confidential in perpetuity. Volunteers are not permitted to second-guess this decision.

The recommendation must be consistent with the team's findings and be supported by the report. When writing the recommendation, you are required to use the template provided by the NAAB.

If the visiting team is reviewing two programs for continuing accreditation, they will receive two templates.

Team Comments after each Condition or Criterion for Conditions I.2.1-II.4.7

After each Condition or SPC, regardless of the team's determination, the team **must** include a brief comment or statement. Four examples follow:

> In the case of a Condition being assessed positively (e.g., met): "The language required in Appendix 5 of the *2014 Conditions for Accreditation,* was found in all promotional materials for the program, including online materials."

> In the case of a Condition being not described or demonstrated: "The team reviewed the APR and the description of the administrative structure for the program. After reviewing the diagram, text, and asking questions of the program's leadership, the team was not able to fully understand the program's administrative structure within the university."

> In the case of an SPC being met, "The team found evidence that students are achieving at the level of ability in work prepared for ARC 651, Studio 6. The team took note of the significant integration of classroom projects in life safety, building materials and assemblies, and building service systems with studio projects prepared for this course."

> In the case of an SPC being not met: "Evidence provided by the program did not demonstrate that students had reached the required level of ability."[2]

---

[2] Under this circumstance, the team must document that it gave the program an opportunity to provide additional student work to demonstrate achievement at the required level.

Generally, throughout the VTR:

DO	DO NOT
Focus on what the evidence is telling you	Give advice
Use words like could, would	Use words like must, should, ought
Identify challenges or deficiencies without speculation. (E.g., During the visit, the vice president for facilities made clear that replacing the building would not be a priority until late 2022.)	Speculate on possible out-year consequences if challenges or deficiencies are not addressed. (E.g., The lack of commitment by the university to replace the building before 2022 is likely to severely curtail student recruitment, faculty retention, and major gifts.
Write short, objective sentences. E.g., As part of Big State University, the program is included in institution-wide initiatives for recruiting faculty from traditionally-underrepresented groups. This includes access to funds within the provost's office for the purpose of recruiting new faculty. Most recently, the program used funds from this initiative to recruit three African-American faculty.	Write long, literate sentences that may might imply something about the program. E.g., Big State University has a long history of difficulty attracting and retaining faculty from traditionally underrepresented groups. However, with help from a fund managed by the provost's office, the program has finally been able to recruit three African-Americans.
Document a program's intent to correct deficiencies or lack thereof	Be overly critical or take deficiencies out of context

Degree Titles and Abbreviations

All NAAB-accredited degree should be abbreviated as follows:

- Bachelor of Architecture = B. Arch.

- Master of Architecture = M. Arch.

- Doctor of Architecture = D. Arch.

Degree titles should not be represented by the number of years (e.g., 4+2). Instead, they should to show the title of the degree, any prerequisites plus the total number and type[3] of credits to be earned at the institution offering the NAAB-accredited program). For example:

---

[3] Semester or quarter; graduate or undergraduate

- B. Arch. (x undergraduate credits)
- M. Arch (single-institution: y undergraduate credits + z graduate credits)
- M. Arch (preprofessional degree + xx graduate credits)
- M. Arch. (non-preprofessional degree + yy graduate credits)
- D. Arch. (preprofessional degree + yyy graduate credits)
- D. Arch. (nonpre-professional degree + zzz graduate credits**)**

It is not uncommon for institutions with graduate degree programs to offer more than one track or pathway for completing the degree. See below for additional information when evaluating a program with multiple tracks.

Capital Letters

Do not capitalize any noun that is not a proper name, including the names of institutions or academic units within institutions. For example,

> The Russell College of Art and Design is located on the central campus of the University of Someplace...

> The design college is on the central campus of the university …

You may capitalize someone's title if it is immediately followed by his/her last name (e.g. Dean Winters). However, if you are using his/her title, without the last name, the word should not be capitalized, (e.g., I saw the dean leave the building). Further, a title should not be capitalized when it is used as follows, "Dr. Jan Winters, dean of the college…"

Generally speaking, these words **do not** need capital letters:

architecture	head
architect	director
students	team
president	visiting team
provost	team room
vice president	professor
college	program
program	curriculum/a
department	alumnus/a/i/ae
faculty	bachelor
university	master
dean	doctorate/doctoral
chair	

Should/Ought v. Would/Could

Do not write recommendations for changes or alterations to a particular element of the program. Rather than write, "… the program is encouraged to develop a plan for

addressing this matter before the next visit," write, "… having a plan to address this matter is an element of Condition I.1.2."

Consistency of Assessments & Comments ("Met, but…")

Even with the changes to the Conditions and the VTR template, there are, with limited exceptions, only two choices:

- Demonstrated/Not Demonstrated
- Described/Not Described
- Met/Not Met

In the case of assessing programs in candidacy, the team may indicate that a Condition or SPC is not-yet-met, in-progress, or not applicable.

The team's assessment of an individual Condition or SPC should be consistent with the comments that follow each assessment (see below). Inconsistencies between these two elements are confusing to the Board and raise concerns within the program. This is the most common obstacle to ensuring the Board understands the team's recommendation on a term of accreditation.

Teams may not assess any individual Condition or SPC with extra adjectives or qualifiers such as "minimally met," "mostly adequate," or "met with concern," or any other variations. Thus, do not score "Met," or its equivalent, on an individual Condition or SPC and then follow that assessment with a narrative describing the team's concerns. This sends mixed messages to the Board and later to the program. The team must make a determination as to whether the Condition or SPC is or is not met.

If the team believes there are sufficient concerns or deficiencies, they should choose "not met," or its equivalent, and briefly describe the concerns.

Any *VTR* that includes inconsistent or "met, but" language will be returned to the team chair for revision.

Programs with Multiple Tracks for Completion of the Accredited Degree

Many institutions offer alternative pathways for completing the accredited degree. These are, for the most part, found in graduate programs and are, generally referred to as tracks.

Tracks are designed to allow students with differing preparatory education to be admitted to the graduate program and to earn an accredited M. Arch.

Individual tracks for completing an accredited degree do not constitute separate degree programs and should not be evaluated as such.

When a team is evaluating a graduate degree with multiple tracks, the team should pay close attention to materials submitted for Condition II.2. Professional Degrees and Curriculum, Condition II.3, Evaluation of Preparatory Education, and the SPC matrix.

Next, the team is advised to look closely at the individual curriculum for each track and to determine whether students admitted with preprofessional degrees in architecture are following a significantly different curriculum from students admitted with undergraduate degrees in other disciplines.

The program must provide work from all students in all tracks, especially if students in one track are following a curriculum that differs significantly from another.

Finally, under such circumstances, the team will prepare a single *VTR*. The tracks are not to be identified within the *VTR*, except on the cover. Separate tracks should also be

identified in the confidential recommendation. The assessment, as written in the *VTR,* should be for the degree program as a single unit.

In the event, the team believes that students in one track are not achieving at the prescribed level for a particular SPC, then the team is expected to assess the SPC as "Not Met." In the accompanying narrative, the team should explain its reasoning and clearly identify which group of students may not be achieving at the prescribed level.

Assessing II.1. C.3. Integrative Design

This SPC is defined as follows:

> **Integrative Design:** *Ability* to make design decisions within a complex architectural project while demonstrating broad integration and consideration of environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies.

This SPC requires students to demonstrate the integrative thinking and application of technical knowledge and design skills that shape complex design and technical solutions.

The student work must demonstrate the ability to resolve the multiple demands of site, program, codes, environmental stewardship, and building systems through a rigorous process of decision making and then to document or represent their choices accurately.

Programs are not required to demonstrate evidence of integration of all issues (i.e., environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies) simultaneously in single projects. However, students should carry out projects of sufficient complexity to achieve the learning outcomes of this SPC.

Integrative design may be taught in single studios, or over multiple courses (e.g., a design studio coupled with a technical documentation course). Programs are encouraged to explore the best format for achieving this SPC.

There is more about C.3 on pages 38-39.

Advice from the NAAB Directors

Each year, the NAAB directors review and evaluate the VTRs. The following comments are based on the results of their evaluations of VTRs from spring 2016 visits.

- Do not add check boxes to those sections that are not being evaluated by the team. If you find one in your template and it isn't supposed to be there, you may delete it.

- Do not use hyperlinks in VTRs – they often break in the transfer and editing process.

- Be sure to appropriately cite or quote references to APRs in VTRs. Do not assume the board understands the references or has ready access to the APR.

- If you copy material from the APR into the VTR, be sure to quote it directly and cite the source e.g., "…**we developed a new studio to address both social responsibility and resiliency (APR, p. 33)**.

- If you choose to reference material from the APR and write the section from the team's point of view, be sure to change the appropriate nouns/pronouns to match the point of view of the team: **according to the APR the program developed a new studio** … [no quotation marks].

- Be sure to identify whether a program is on semesters or quarters in the cover page:

  > E.g., "Track I (pre-professional degree + 60 semester credit hours) or B. Arch. (225 undergraduate quarter credit hours)

- Establish a consistent vocabulary for identifying tracks in a graduate program; do not use "Track I" and "4+2" interchangeably. Only you and the program know what is meant by this shorthand.

- If you have requested additional student work as part of the visit, be sure to acknowledge it in the VTR.

  > E.g., "**A.4   Architectural Design Skills:** *Ability* to effectively use basic formal, organizational, and environmental principles and the capacity of each to inform two- and three-dimensional design.
  >
  > **[X] Met**
  >
  > **[ ] Not Met**
  >
  > **2017 Team Assessment:** In addition to work presented in the team room at the start of the visit, the program provided student work during the course of the visit. As a result, evidence of student achievement at the prescribed level was found in student work prepared for ARCH 505 Design Studio II.

- Limit Met with Distinction (Appendix 1) to SPC only.

- Only those items found to be deficient during the course of a visit and identified as such in a VTR form the scope of a program's Interim Progress Report. If your team wants to ensure that the program will be required to report on its progress toward addressing a deficiency, you must identify the Condition or SPC as deficient (e.g., Not Met, or its equivalent).

If a team is having difficulty writing the *VTR*, please feel free to call the NAAB executive director or accreditation manager at 202.783.2007. After hours, please send email to arutledge@naab.org or cpair@naab.org. You can also send a text to 202.372.9372.

In this section, we will provide you with some basic protocols, what to do if something goes wrong during a visit, and the answers to commonly-asked questions.

Site Visit Protocols

- **Treat all programs with the same degree of respect:** Deficiencies encountered at a prestigious institution should be provided with the same objective assessment offered to programs in less prestigious institutions. It is inappropriate to minimize or turn a blind eye to deficiencies or concerns out of deference to an institution's perceived stature.

- **Treat all programs with the same degree of openness.** One of the strengths of the NAAB system is that the conditions are written to avoid homogenization of educational experiences. Programs are encouraged to innovate and to be creative in how they deliver education. Team members must be open to creative solutions and focus on **whether** programs meet the *Conditions* rather than **how** they do so.

- **Celebrate success.** Accreditation is meant to be a constructive process to improve architectural education.

- **Do not superimpose preconceived attitudes about architectural education or curriculum.** Every program should be understood in the context of its own unique mission and institutional setting.

- **Do not publicly divulge insider information:** All the information obtained by a team member in the course of a site visit is privileged and confidential. Disclosure of such information is grounds for a reconsideration of a term of accreditation.

- **Do not privately divulge insider information:** A visiting team's sole assignment is to assess a program's compliance with the conditions for accreditation. It is a breach of trust to disclose any information that is not pertinent to this assignment within the program or the institution.

- **Do not use the accreditation visit as a recruiting opportunity:** It is inappropriate to solicit personnel for your own program or office during a site visit. It is inappropriate to indicate your interest in being employed by an institution in any capacity until after the institution has received its accreditation decision.

- **Do not accept institutional gifts:** It is inappropriate to accept any institutional gifts, favors or services during a site visit. Do your best to politely decline.

- **Do not overreact to or ignore deficiencies:** Bear in mind that the accreditation process includes a structured method by which a program can improve and correct its deficiencies. It is inappropriate to react to deficiencies in a punitive, threatening manner or, conversely, to ignore them out of unfounded optimism.

- **Do not forget your role:** The long hours, intensive work, and fatigue can lead you to lower your guard in an attempt to lighten the mood or cut tension. Do not forget that visiting teams are under observation at all times. Your comments and behavior, including your presence on social media (see below), are closely analyzed and can be misinterpreted.

- **Do not offer personal solutions:** It is inappropriate to suggest how a program might meet the NAAB Conditions or in any way impose your personal views on program structure, administration, and pedagogy.

- **Do not speculate on whether or how deficiencies may affect a program over time.** Programs, generally, are aware of their deficiencies and are unlikely to be surprised at the final interview. That said, it is inappropriate to use the VTR as a platform for speculating on whether or how a given deficiency may affect a program over time. If you find yourself tempted to add something like "the failure of the university to provide a new building will affect student recruitment" to the VTR, take a moment to delete that phrase.

- **Be circumspect when using social media.** It is important that teams and team members conduct themselves professionally at all times. Team members are not prohibited from using social media while on a visit, however, team members are advised to refrain from posting anything that could be interpreted later as an assessment of the program, a commentary on the program's compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation, or a recommendation on a term of accreditation. To be completely safe, team members are encouraged, to paraphrase George Bernard Shaw, "to stick to two subjects: the weather and everybody's health."

- **Alcohol.** The NAAB does not reimburse team members for alcoholic beverages. Further, the NAAB encourages all team members to avoid consuming alcohol during any on-campus event that includes members of the faculty, staff, student body, or the public.

What to Wear

Team members are encouraged to wear business or business casual attire during the visit. Comfortable shoes and a scarf or sweater are also recommended. The NAAB encourages all team members to be prepared for foul weather during the late winter and early spring.

Problems That May Be Encountered During Visits

Conditions under which a visit might be terminated

Visits may be terminated only under extreme circumstances or catastrophic conditions. See Section 7 of the *2015 Procedures.*

When a team member violates protocol

In the event a team member violates a protocol, particularly in handling confidential information, or in behavior, the team chair should address the lapse with the individual, discuss the consequences and determine whether the lapse constitutes a breach of procedure that could be grounds for reconsideration of a term of accreditation. Next, the team chair should document the lapse and subsequent discussions in a confidential memorandum to the NAAB executive director.

In the event a team chair violates a protocol, it is the responsibility of the other members of the team to address the situation with him/her and to designate an individual to document the lapse in a confidential memorandum to the NAAB executive director.

To avoid these situations, the team chair should review protocols with team members before the visit begins.

When a non-voting team member violates protocol

If the team finds that a non-voting team member's attendance is irregular or disruptive or if he/she advocates for the program or otherwise excuses deficiencies, the team chair must address the behavior with the individual directly. The chair may also discuss the problem with the program administrator. The team chair has the discretion to dismiss the non-voting team member if difficulties cannot be resolved.

Commonly-Asked Questions

What is required in the program's self-assessment?

Self-assessment is a means for programs to evaluate their progress toward achieving long-term or strategic goals. It includes a description of the process and the types of data and information gathered in the assessment process. The 2014 *Condition*s establish the expectation that the entire academic community is included in the process of self-assessment. Institutional self-assessment procedures may complement or supplement the program's own self-assessment. Ask about these if they are not described in the APR.

Are there differences between major and minor deficiencies?

In distinguishing between "major" and "minor" deficiencies, the team is encouraged to look at the previous VTR, then to consult with the current leadership, and to identify to what extent the "intent to correct" is present within the program. It may also be appropriate, depending on the nature of the deficiency, for the team to consider whether the program or the institution as the "capacity to correct" the problem. Parsing the difference between intent and capacity may aid the team in deciding whether something is a deficiency or a temporary interruption. Further, the team is advised to consider the deficiency with an eye towards its effect on student learning.

When does a problem become a deficiency?

Some conditions are easily discernible as being "met" or "deficient" (for example, Condition II.4: Public Information). Others allow for more subjectivity, making consistency across teams more difficult.

Where deficiencies have existed for more than one accreditation cycle, the team is expected to highlight this in the report.

Should the visiting team take into account how long a deficiency has existed?

Yes.

The length of time a particular problem has existed without being adequately addressed is part of the Board's consideration in making its decision and therefore, should be part of the team's consideration in making its assessment and recommendation.

The previous *VTR* should be appended to the *APR*. Reading this gives the team an opportunity to determine how long the deficiency has existed and what steps the program has taken to address the problem. Based on that information, and direct questioning of program administrators during the visit, the team must determine whether the program is making a good-faith effort to address the deficiency. If programs have continuously or willfully failed to address a deficiency over at least one accreditation cycle, the team is expected to note this in the report.

Does the visiting team make a holistic assessment of the program, or individual assessments of each of the Conditions and SPC?

The *VTR* is formatted to allow the team to evaluate each of the Conditions, including the 26 SPC in the 2014 *Conditions* individually. This is Part II of the *VTR.*

In Part I of the *VTR,* the team is expected to offer a holistic evaluation of the program in "Acknowledgements and Observations."

In addition, the team is also asked to assess the program's response to the previous *VTR*. The results of all of these assessments, taken together, should inform and support the team's recommendation to the Board.

The overall evaluation and team recommendation should be based on both the individual evaluations and the more holistic evaluation.

Are there separate *VTR*s for different degree programs or paths at the same institution?

No.

When one team is conducting a concurrent review for continuing accreditation of more than one accredited degree program, a single *VTR* is prepared. The team will receive a *VTR* template that includes all the relevant sections for both degree programs.

When one team is reviewing a single accredited degree program with multiple tracks for completing the accredited degree (NOTE: This is often the situation when reviewing an accredited M. Arch. degree), a single *VTR* is prepared. The tracks are not to be identified within the *VTR*, except on the cover and in the confidential recommendation.

Should the team recommendation be made public?

No.

The team's recommendation is advisory and non-binging. It is kept confidential in perpetuity. Failure to maintain this level of confidentiality may be grounds for a reconsideration of a term of accreditation.

How do programs demonstrate satisfaction of Criterion C.3. Comprehensive Design?

The program must identify the course/s in which integrative design is most fully met and then provide evidence that students are achieving at the level of ability by displaying student work that demonstrates their achievement. It is not up to the team to determine when and how a particular program teaches comprehensive design. See also the comments on pages 25 and 38-39.

In Condition I.2.2 Physical Resources, what is the meaning of "space to support and encourage the full range of faculty roles and responsibilities including preparation for teaching, research, mentoring, and student advising?"

Faculty members have four areas of responsibility: teaching, research, mentoring, and advising. In order for each faculty member to meet his/her responsibilities in each area, he/she is expected to have the use of an office or other workspace that can accommodate all four roles and provide the necessary privacy to mentor and advise students in confidence. This is generally applied only to full-time instructional faculty and not to adjuncts or to other faculty that do not have responsibilities for advising students.

What should a team member do if he/she is lobbied by the faculty, students, or others to address a perceived deficiency in resources so that the program can lobby the university for additional resources?

This is a common occurrence during visits. Faculty, staff, and students may approach a team member or the chair and ask him/her to "really emphasize that we need more faculty" in the *VTR*. Under such circumstances, the best course of action is to listen carefully to the individual, but to make no commitments.

What should a team member do if a member of the university administration asks the team to assess the qualifications of the program administrator?

This type of question places the team in an awkward situation. The best response is to let the chair respond by saying, "I am sorry, but I cannot answer that question. That type of evaluation isn't part of an accreditation visit."

Team Travel and Accommodations

Travel arrangements are made by the individual travelers, and should be arranged through the NAAB's official travel agency, American Express, 1.800.872.9954.

Air travel is economy coach class only. Please purchase your tickets with a view toward securing the lowest fares.

The program being visited pays for hotel and subsistence expenses, including all local travel incurred during the visit, for a non-voting member nominated by the program or institution, and for any additional team members including those required because the program offers two or more professional degrees.

The team is responsible for making its own arrangements for ground transportation. The use of rental cars must be approved in advance by the office in consultation with the program.

Team Member Reimbursement Requests

Immediately following the visit, team members complete a reimbursement form provided by the NAAB office, and submit original receipts for all expenses regardless of the amount (a reimbursement requirement of most programs).

The NAAB office must receive all reimbursement requests within 30 days of the end of the visit.

Reimbursements

See Section 2 and Appendix 5 of *The Procedures for Accreditation,* 2015 Edition for information on travel reimbursements.

Correspondence between the Team Chair and the Program

The NAAB office is copied on all correspondence between the team chair and the program, and kept informed of the progress on visit agenda finalization.

THE 2014 NAAB CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION

This section reviews the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* with emphasis on several sections.

Conditions I.1-I.2

Part I of the *2014 Conditions* includes twelve distinct conditions for accreditation. These are related to institutional support and commitment to continuous improvement.

Programs demonstrate their compliance with Part One in two ways:

- A narrative report that briefly responds to each request to "demonstrate, describe, or document."

- A review of evidence, artifacts, and observations by the visiting team, as well as through interviews conducted during the visit.

Part I - Section 1 has seven conditions related to identity and self-assessment and includes the following:

- The mission and history of the program

- Social equity

- Learning culture, and studio culture

- The program's response to the Five Perspectives

- The program's long-range planning activities

- The program's self-assessment activities (NOTE: there are two self-assessment conditions)

Teams do not evaluate or assess a program's responses to Part I-Section 1. Instead the team will summarize the information provided by the program in the APR and confirmed by the team during the visit (see 2015 Procedures, VTR template).

Part I – Section 2 has five conditions related to administrative structure and the resources (human, financial, physical, and information) that support the program given its mission, history, and culture.

Part I is designed to be evaluated on the basis of whether

- The program has clearly identified its mission and history and culture and supports a culture of planning and assessment (Conditions I.1.1-I.1.6).

- The program has adequate resources for delivering a professional education in architecture within the framework of its mission and culture (Conditions I.2.1-I.2.5).

Teams determine on the basis of information presented in the APR, supplemental information appended to the APR, and interview during the visit whether the program as described or demonstrated its resources and administrative structure (see 2015 Procedures, VTR template).

These determinations are, generally, based on a review several types of artifacts:

- The *APR*.

- The university catalog (usually online, but not exclusively)

- The program's website

- Supporting documents presented electronically 30 days in advance of the visit (see 2015 Procedures, Section 5).

- Face-to-face meetings with faculty, staff, students, and administrators.

If a team member does not believe he/she has sufficient material to make an assessment on a specific Condition, he/she should advise the team chair and make a list of the materials needed.

I.2.1. Human Resources and Human Resource Development - Architect Licensing Advisor

Programs are required, as an element of Condition I.2.1, Human Resources and Human Resource Development, to demonstrate that "an Architectural Licensing Advisor has been appointed, is trained in the issues of AXP (formerly IDP), has regular communication with students, is fulfilling the requirements as outlined in the ALA position description, and regular attends ALA training and development programs."

The responsibilities of an ALA are defined by NCARB and include:

1. Regularly attend and/or participate in ALA training and development programs outlined in section VI. Support and Resources.

2. Provide an orientation to all students on the required components of licensure (education, experience, & examination) at the point they are eligible to establish an NCARB Record to begin earning experience in the AXP.

3. Document *AXP Eligibility Dates* for students establishing an NCARB Record.

4. Update NCARB as requested regarding programs which interface directly with AXP such as advanced degrees and work study/co-op programs.

5. Communicate with NCARB to maintain a thorough understanding of AXP requirements, objectives and resources, particularly relating to core and supplementary education opportunities allowed prior to graduation.

6. Be familiar with state registration requirements, the Architect Registration Examination® (ARE®) and the application procedures.

7. Communicate and collaborate with NCARB and AXP support networks (including AIAS chapters, Architect Licensing Advisors, local and national AIA components, YAF and NAC groups, state registration boards, etc.) to strengthen awareness of the required components of licensure and its importance among students.

Evidence that a program has fulfilled this element of Condition I.2.1 may include, but are not limited to the following:

- Attendance at the ALA conferences between 2010 and 2016.

- Assisting students with establishing Council Records.

- Coordination with NCARB as requested regarding advanced degree and academic internship programs that may be/are eligible to earn AXP credit

- Coordination with NCARB to offer presentations by a member of the NCARB Programs Outreach Team when NCARB schedules a visit to the school.

- Utilization of the NCARB Programs Outreach Team for webinar presentations

- Utilization of the *Career Building Blocks* presentation series and other NCARB resources in on-campus presentations

- Implementing and maintaining a plan to promote licensure. This includes presentations to new and existing students about the components of licensure, the NCARB Record, details of the AXP, and specifically options to earn experience while in school

- Availability to respond to students with general questions on NCARB programs and the components of licensure

- Links and referrals to NCARB and AIA websites or publications

- Commitment to the ALA program through engagement in and utilization of the ALA Community.

Condition II.1: Student Performance Criteria (SPC)

Part II. Section 1 contains the 26 individual SPC grouped into four realms.

- Realm A: Critical Thinking and Representation

- Realm B: Building Practices, Technical Skills and Knowledge

- Realm C: Integrated Architectural Solutions

- Realm C: Professional Practice

The objectives of each realm are intended as aspirations rather than a list of "musts" and "shoulds." While the realm itself will not be assessed as met/not met, the visiting team is asked to provide a brief narrative in the *VTR* that describes how the program reflects or responds to the aspirations of each realm.

The NAAB establishes performance criteria to ensure that accredited degree programs prepare students for the profession while encouraging educational practices suited to the individual degree program.

The accredited degree program must demonstrate that each graduate possesses the knowledge and skills defined by the 26 criteria. The knowledge and skills are the minimum for meeting the demands of an internship leading to registration for practice.

The program must provide evidence that its graduates have satisfied each criterion through required coursework. If credits are granted for courses taken at other institutions or online, evidence must be provided that the courses are comparable to those offered in the accredited degree program

Although the NAAB stipulates the SPC that must be met, it does not specify the educational format or the form of student work that may serve as evidence for having met the criteria.

Programs are encouraged to develop unique learning and teaching strategies, methods, and materials to satisfy these criteria. The NAAB encourages innovative methods for satisfying the criteria, provided the program has a formal evaluation process for assessing student achievement of these criteria and documenting the results.

For the purpose of accreditation, graduating students must demonstrate understanding or ability as defined below. The criteria encompass two levels of accomplishment[4]

> ***Understanding***—The capacity to classify, compare, summarize, explain and/or interpret information.

---

[4] See also *Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. L.W. Anderson & D.R. Krathwold, Eds. (New York; Longman 2001).

Ability—Proficiency in using specific information to accomplish a task, correctly selecting the appropriate information, and accurately applying it to the solution of a specific problem, while also distinguishing the effects of its implementation.

Conditions II.2-II.4

The last twelve Conditions address three important areas:

- Curricular Framework (II.2.1-II.2.3)

- Evaluation of Preparatory/Pre-professional Education (II.3)

- Public Information (II.4)

- Annual and Interim Reports (III.1-III.2)

Condition II.2 contains two conditions related to the curricular framework for the accredited degree program(s) including:

- Regional accreditation

- Professional Degrees and Curriculum

Condition II.3 remains a stand-alone condition on the requirement that all programs have both policies and processes for evaluating the preparatory education of students admitted to the NAAB-accredited program. Programs must demonstrate that students entering graduate programs that require preparatory education are being evaluated and advised appropriately.

Conditions II.4.1-II.4.7 identify seven distinct items related to how the program represents itself to prospective students and the public. These include:

- Required text for program websites and catalogs (II.4.1 and Appendix 5).

- Access to the *NAAB Conditions* and *NAAB Procedures* (II.4.2)

- A minimum standard for providing career development information to students and their parents (II.4.3)

- Public access to *APRs* and *VTRs* (II.4.4)

- A link to the ARE pass rates as reported by NCARB (II.4.5)

- Admissions and advising (II.4.6 and Condition II.3)

- Access to financial information (II.4.7)

Conditions III.1 and III.2 identify requirements for reporting between visit years. Compliance with both reporting requirements is a condition of accreditation.

Each of these Conditions is assessed separately in the *VTR.*

Notes from the 2014 Conditions Writing Team

There are a number of differences between the 2009 and 2014 Conditions for Accreditation. In preparing the final draft, the writing team believed that sharing some of their notes would aid teams and programs in preparing for visits using the new conditions. These notes follow.

Notes on the Perspectives (Condition I.4)

The perspectives offer programs the opportunity to define the means and methods most appropriate to their mission, history, and pedagogy to prepare students with a set of core values that are essential and fundamental to the practice of architecture. These values are held as perspectives instead of SPC, as they must transcend any one course and must be over-arching across the program.

   A. *Collaboration and Leadership:* The program should address this perspective by describing how students develop the interpersonal skills for fostering team unity, communication and decision-making, conflict resolution, cultural awareness and empathy, and the motivating purposes to effectively achieve commonly held goals, and where those skills are being taught/demonstrated. Graduates should be prepared to function in a diverse world of practice with the ability to adapt to complex team situations and effectively address a climate of shifting priorities. This perspective also includes how a program prepares emerging professionals to serve clients and the public, engage allied disciplines and professional colleagues, and rely on a spectrum of collaborative skills to work successfully across diverse groups and stakeholders. This condition can be satisfied by demonstrating how students lead and collaborate across multiple opportunities ranging from structured coursework opportunities to program activities and events and external programs and events.

   B. *Design:* Programs should describe how graduates are prepared to engage in design activity as a multi-stage process aimed to address increasingly complex problems, and provide value and an improved future. This includes how students learn the combinations of methods, skills and cognitive processes, as well as identifying and framing problems from a complex milieu; generative and evaluative strategies; cycles of conjecture, implementation and evaluation; methods of research, technical expertise, skillful action and judgment.

   C. *Professional Opportunity:* As programs reflect their approach to preparing students for traditional settings responding to this perspective includes how students are prepared for the transition to internship and licensure; with an understanding of the requirements for registration in the jurisdiction in which the program is located; and with the information needed to enroll in the Intern Development Program (IDP)[5]. For programs with students preparing for other-than-traditional settings this should include how programs develop students' understanding of alternative roles for architects in the building industry (e.g., developer, owners' representative, program manager, or civic leader), as well as roles in numerous other disciplines where architectural expertise is highly valued.

   D. *Stewardship of the Environment:* This includes teaching design practices that seek to minimize negative environmental impact and to connect people with the natural environment. The program's approach may also include individual courses that develop a student's understanding of climate, geography and other natural characteristics and phenomena. Further, these courses may also include content on the laws and practices governing architects and the built

---

[5] In 2016, NCARB changed the name of this program to Architect Experience Program (AXP).

environment as well as the ethos of sustainable practices. Finally, the program's approach may also include opportunities for students to engage in political advocacy on environmental issues; involvement in organizations for a sustainable future; or participation and leadership in university initiatives supporting environmental awareness and sustainability.

E. *Community and Social Responsibility.* The social responsibility of architects lies in part in the belief that architects can create better places, and further that architectural design can create a civilized place by making communities more livable. A program's response to social responsibility must include nurturing a calling to civic engagement to positively influence the development, conservation or changes to the built and natural environment. Addressing this perspective could include examples of public and community projects/programs outside of coursework, or as structured elements within coursework.

Notes on Student Performance Criteria

A.3 Investigative Skills: This SPC refers specifically to investigative skills rather than to the broader definition of research or scholarship. The intent is to ensure that students are able to identify, find, select, and use the full range of information resources available to them.

B.3 Codes and Regulations: It is not the intent of this SPC to be a complete checklist of codes that students have mastered. Rather, students must demonstrate the ability to incorporate the fundamentals of multiple codes.

C.1 Research: The purpose of the SPC is for students to demonstrate their understanding of the many methods of research and study that may be used in the course of identifying and selecting solutions to the problems encountered in a complex architectural project.

C.3 Integrative Design. This SPC requires students to demonstrate the integrative thinking and application of technical knowledge and design skills that shape complex design and technical solutions.

The student work must demonstrate the ability to resolve the multiple demands of site, program, codes, environmental stewardship, and building systems through a rigorous process of decision making and then to document or represent their choices accurately.

Programs are not required to demonstrate evidence of integration of all issues (i.e., environmental stewardship, technical documentation, accessibility, site conditions, life safety, environmental systems, structural systems, and building envelope systems and assemblies) simultaneously in single projects. However, students should carry out projects of sufficient complexity to achieve the learning outcomes of this SPC.

Integrative design may be taught in single studios, or over multiple courses (e.g., a design studio coupled with a technical documentation course). Programs are encouraged to explore the best format for achieving this SPC. **Programs are required to describe the approach in the APR.**

2009 Conditions	v.	2014 Conditions
Assessing whether students have made decisions about how to integrate these elements into their work.		Assessing whether students have the ability to resolve the multiple demands of site, program codes, et. al. and to integrate those choices into the project.

Absence of any element from a single project is probably not grounds for assessing the SPC as NOT MET. Teams are encouraged to look for narrative, notes, or other work that describes the student's decision process that led to its not being included or integrated into the design.

The consistent absence of the same element (e.g., site design) from all work (high and low pass) submitted for C.3 may lead to an assessment of NOT MET. In this case, the team should include some comment to this effect in the VTR. For example,

MET	NOT MET
The absence of different elements from a range of projects (e.g., accessibility from one and site conditions from another) may lead to an assessment of MET. In this case the team should include some comment in the VTR. For example: "The team found evidence that this SPC is met in work from ARC 510, Integrated Studio V. However, in making its assessment, the team noticed that the technical documentation of students' choices was inconsistent."	The consistent absence of the same element (e.g., site conditions) from all work (high and low pass) submitted for C.3 may lead to an assessment of NOT MET. In this case, the team should include some comment to this effect in the VTR. For example, "In making its assessment the team noted that in all student work presented for C.3, Integrative Design, there was little to no evidence of the integration of life safety systems, further, students did not accurately document their choices."

The possible terms of accreditation that may be recommended by visiting teams are defined in Section 3 of the *2015 Procedures.* Some additional advice on each one follows. These terms apply only to programs that have at least one term of continuing accreditation.

Eight-Year Term

If the team believes that the deficiencies, if any, are minor, and both the program and the institution have demonstrated intent to correct them, the team can recommend an eight-year term.

Four-Year Term

This term indicates that major deficiencies are present in at least three of the following areas at the time of the current visit and may also have been present at the time of the previous visit:

> Learning Culture
>
> Social Equity
>
> Long-Range Planning
>
> Assessment
>
> Human Resources and Human Resource Development
>
> Physical Resources
>
> Financial Resources
>
> Information Resources
>
> Student Performance Criteria

Additionally, a program may receive a reduced term if any single SPC has been identified as Not Met for a second, consecutive accreditation visit.

In the event a team finds an SPC Not Met for a second, consecutive visit, the VTR must include a record of the team's efforts to be thorough in its assessment. Further, the program is required to provide a response to the team's assessment when it submits corrections of fact for the VTR (see Procedures p. 56-57)

- Multiple deficiencies in these areas sufficiently affect the quality of the program and a full accreditation review is required after less than eight years. At the next scheduled review following a first four-year term, the program may receive an eight-year term, a second four-year term, or a two-year probationary term.

- At the next scheduled review following a second, consecutive four-year term, the program may receive either an eight-year term or a two-year probationary term. No more than two, consecutive four-year terms can be awarded to a program.

Two-Year Probationary Term

This term indicates that the deficiencies are severe enough to have eroded the quality of the program and that the intent or capability to correct these deficiencies is not evident.

For visits conducted in 2017, such a recommendation, generally, would be made when a program with a three-year term has failed to address the deficiencies identified by the previous team.

Recommending a two-year probationary term sends a signal to the Board that the team believes the program is in danger of failing and incapable of providing a learning environment where students can succeed at the levels of achievement proscribed by the *Conditions*.

In the event the Board approves a two-year probationary term the following steps are taken:

- The program is on probation and must show cause for the continuance of its accreditation.

- At its next scheduled review, the program must receive at least a four-year term or accreditation will be revoked.

- The next scheduled review of a program that has received a two-year probationary term usually will be conducted by a team consisting of three former NAAB directors and a person not from the NAAB.

- At the next scheduled review following a two-year probationary term, the program must receive at least a four-year term of accreditation. Consecutive, two-year probationary terms cannot be awarded to a program

- If a four-year term follows a two-year probationary term, the program must receive an eight-year term at the next scheduled review or accreditation will be revoked

Revocation of Accreditation

If a team that is undertaking a visit at the end of a two-year probationary term has determined that insufficient progress was made during a two-year probationary term to warrant a four-year term, then the team may recommend revoking accreditation. Under such circumstances, this is the team's only option.

Accreditation can also be revoked if the team observes and documents substantial and uncorrectable noncompliance with the NAAB *Conditions* during any site visit.

Notes about Recommendations for 2017 Visits for Continuing Accreditation

The NAAB is still making the transition to eight-year terms. Programs visited in 2017 have either six-year terms awarded in 2011 or three-year terms awarded in 2014.

Programs with six-year terms or three-year terms of **continuing accreditation** are eligible for any one of the following:

- An eight-year term

- A four-year term

- A two-year probationary term.

Initial Candidacy

Programs seeking candidacy may be granted a period of candidacy of not less than two years. Candidate programs are subsequently reviewed every two years until they achieve initial accreditation. Programs have six years to achieve initial accreditation.

Initial Accreditation

Programs seeking initial accreditation for candidate programs may be granted a term of initial accreditation of three years.

Continuing Accreditation Following Initial Accreditation

Programs that have achieved a term of initial accreditation must subsequently achieve an eight-year term of accreditation during their first visit for continuing accreditation or accreditation may be revoked. A two-year term is not an option.

For more information on candidacy and initial accreditation see the *2015 Procedures,* Sections 2, 3, and 4.

Accreditation Decisions

The final decision on a term of accreditation is made by the Board. In making its decision, the Board relies upon the documented observations and assessments of the visiting team, as recorded in the *VTR*. The Board may also review the *APR*, and the program's response to the *VTR*.

Decisions on terms of accreditation are based on whether the visiting team has indicated in the *VTR* that the program:

- Is making reasonable progress toward eliminating the deficiencies identified during the previous site visit;

- Offers an overall learning environment that meets the NAAB *Conditions* for a professional degree program;

- Is producing graduates whose work demonstrates satisfaction of the SPC;

- Has the human, physical, information, and financial resources to sustain an adequate level of achievement.

NAAB's Accreditation Timeline for Spring 2017 Visits

Month/Timing (approx.)	*Activity*
July 2016	Visit list confirmed
August 2016	Chairs & teams nominated & approved
	Programs challenge or approve the chair
September 7, 2016	*Architecture Program Reports* due
	Chairs & programs set dates for visits
October 2016	Chairs review *APR*s
	NAAB completes the team nominations
	Programs approve teams
November 2016	Team training
Late January-Early April 2017	Visits take place
10 days after the visit ends	First draft of *Visiting Team Report* (VTR) due in NAAB office
Late March-mid-June 2016	*VTR*s are edited and reviewed by the NAAB
	Programs may make corrections of fact
	Chairs complete a final edit including a review of the corrections of fact
	Program may write a response to the final draft
Four weeks before July 2017 NAAB meeting	Final *VTRs* w/ confidential recommendations and responses from the programs are posted for Board review
July 2017 meeting	Decisions made
14 days after July 2017 meeting	Decision letters sent to institution's president w/ copies to program administrator and team

For fall visits, this sequence is the same, although the APRs are not due until March 1 of the year in which the visit takes place and decisions are made at the February meeting following the visit.

SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE 2014 AND 2009 EDITIONS OF THE *CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION*

The *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* represent the NAAB's best effort to synthesize the outcomes of ARC13 and the public comment received since August 2013. While a number of these revisions are modest, there are several that are significant. They are highlighted here:

- The first difference is the absence of instructions and the phase "The APR must include…" followed by a long list of documents, tables following each condition. The NAAB felt strongly that this type of material should be captured in an advisory document that could be revised annually based on best practices, surveys and visit evaluations. The Board also felt strongly that many of these instructions had calcified over time and were losing relevance in the process. By removing them, the NAAB believed programs would be given greater flexibility to respond to each condition within its own context.

- Wherever possible, the NAAB clarified whether programs "must" or "should" provide information, documentation, or other materials in support of its self-evaluation.

- Next, the NAAB carefully considered ways to re-balance institutional commitment to continuous improvement (Part I) and educational outcomes and curriculum (Part II) with a view toward shifting the time and attention of visiting teams toward Part II. To that end, the NAAB changed the format for the Architecture Program Report (APR), instructions to teams regarding review of materials that support a program's responses to the requirements of Part I, and the format both for the visit and the Visiting Team Report (VTR).

- Verification and review of certain types of materials now takes place in advance of the visit, while onsite work should focus on student learning and progress since the previous visit.

- There are five new perspectives. These identify values and core principles held in common throughout the profession and the academy relative to both the practice and discipline of architecture. The five, new perspectives are:
    - Leadership and Collaboration
    - Design
    - Professional Opportunity
    - Stewardship of the Environment
    - Community and Social Responsibility

- The NAAB reduced the number of SPC to 26.

- Based on input at ARC13, the NAAB made a conscious decision to establish a perspective on environmental stewardship and also to embed responsibility for the environment and sustainable practices into several SPC. ARC13 participants believed that a stand-alone SCP on sustainability did not sufficiently express the extent to which environmental considerations needed to be included across the spectrum of design decision-making. As a result, the specific SPC on sustainability was eliminated.

- The NAAB created a fourth realm, Realm C, to address student achievement for integrative design. This realm is about the ability to demonstrate the full scope of integrative thinking that shapes complex design and technical solutions. This skill set begins with research and selection, proceeds through decision-making, and concludes with documentation (see below).

- The NAAB revised the condition on Professional Degrees and Curriculum (II.2.2). These revisions are intended to accomplish several things:
    - First, to clarify what courses and content meet the definition for general studies.
    - Second, to remove the burden of remediating general studies requirements for students admitted to M. Arch. or D. Arch. programs that require an undergraduate degree for admission.

- o Finally, the NAAB has made the titles B. Arch., M. Arch. and D. Arch. exclusive to the NAAB-accredited degree.
- There are two new conditions in Public Information (II.4). These are
    - o II.4.6 Admissions and Advising
    - o II.4.7 Student Financial Information

These changes were made in response to repeated calls for creating public information requirements that supported Condition II.3, Evaluation of Preparatory Education, as well as the position of the AIAS, that students had insufficient access to information regarding the financial implications of financial aid decisions and course and materials fees.

(There are more notes in the Handbook)

Architect Licensing Advisors

Architect Licensing Advisors (ALAs) are supported by NCARB through annual conferences, regular newsletters, webinars, and social media.

NCARB has provided the following documents to aid NAAB visiting teams in their review of the level of engagement by the ALAs assigned within NAAB-accredited programs.

These documents were prepared by NCARB, who is solely responsible for their content.

Architect Licensing Advisors Community Position Description

I. **Eligibility**
1. An individual committed to: (any combination of the items below)
    i. assisting interns pursuing licensure as an architect
    ii. helping supervisors assist interns through licensure
    iii. advising architects on reciprocity and NCARB Certification

II. **Role**
1. Serve as an information resource on the required components of licensure (education, experience, & examination) for emerging professionals.
2. Provide information necessary for the transition from internship to licensure within the context of state regulatory requirements, reciprocity, and NCARB certification.
3. Advise and assist interns with the NCARB Record application process.

III. **Responsibilities**
The following is expected of advisors:
1. Regularly attend and/or participate in Architect Licensing Advisors Community training and development programs outlined in section IV, Support and Resources.
2. Communicate with NCARB to maintain a thorough understanding of the IDP requirements, objectives and resources.
3. Communicate with NCARB to maintain a thorough understanding of the Architect Registration Examination® (ARE®) requirements, objectives and resources.
4. Communicate with the state licensing board to maintain a thorough understanding of state registration requirements and procedures.
5. Communicate with NCARB to maintain a thorough understanding of NCARB certification requirements, objectives, and resources.
6. Communicate and collaborate with professional support networks (including NCARB, AIAS chapters, local and national AIA components, YAF and NAC groups, state registration boards, etc.) to strengthen awareness of the required components of licensure and its importance among emerging professionals.

IV. **Support and Resources**
Advisors are provided the following:
1. An invitation to attend an annual Licensing Advisors Summit.
2. NCARB training materials and presentation templates.
3. AIA National training materials such as market research, professional outlook, etc.
4. Staff support from NCARB for assistance with understanding NCARB program requirements and processes.
5. Staff support from AIA for assistance with understanding AIA programs and opportunities.
6. Access to Architect Licensing Advisors Online Community web based information sharing site.

Anyone can be an Architect Licensing Advisor. To become part of the community contact us at advisors@ncarb.org.

Architect Licensing Advisors Appointed Positions
The following are positions that are appointed by specific organizations.

I. **Architect Licensing Advisor appointed by University/School/College of Architecture**
    1. **Eligibility**
        An architecture faculty member or a career counselor/internship coordinator in a college/school of architecture. (Architect license preferred)
    2. **Appointment**
        Appointed by the Dean/Head/Chair of each School/College of Architecture.
    3. **Term**
        Term is determined by the Dean/Head/Chair of each School/College of Architecture.
    4. **Support**
        Potential funding by NCARB to attend the Licensing Advisors Summit for advisors that are appointed by colleges/schools of architecture with a NAAB-accredited degree program.

II. **Architect Licensing Advisor appointed by AIAS Chapter**
    1. **Eligibility**
        Currently enrolled as a student in an architecture program at the institution they are representing. (An NCARB record holder is preferred)
    2. **Appointment**
        Shall be appointed by the AIAS Chapter President.
    3. **Term**
        Each term is for one year only. Term may be renewed for more than one year.
    4. **Support**
        Potential funding by NCARB to attend the Licensing Advisors Summit

III. **Architect Licensing Advisor appointed by State AIA Component**
    1. **Eligibility**
        An individual who has served as an architect licensing advisor for at least one year.
        An architect or an emerging professional on the path to becoming an architect.
    2. **Appointment**
        Shall be appointed by the state AIA Component.
    3. **Term**
        A three year term limit is recommended.
    4. **Support**
        Potential for funding by AIA National to attend the Licensing Advisors Summit.

Appointment process
Appointing organizations should notify NCARB of all newly appointed Architect Licensing Advisors via an email to advisors@ncarb.org. The email must contain the appointed advisor's name and contact information and will be listed publicly on NCARB's website.

Licensing Advisors Summit metrics
August 8, 2016

91 Licensing Advisors appointed by or representing Schools:
- 89 Schools are represented this year:
  - 79 universities with NAAB accredited degree programs
  - 9 universities with candidate-NAAB degree programs
  - 1 school non-NAAB
  - 15 are represented this year that did not attend last year
    - 1 of these schools have never attended before

Attendance 2016*
Listed individuals were in attendance at the 2016 Licensing Advisors Summit and are architect licensing advisors appointed by the school, unless noted otherwise as a "School Representative."

79 universities with NAAB accredited degree programs in attendance this year:
- Academy of Art University (Jennifer Asselstine)
- Andrews University (Thomas Lowing)
- Auburn University (Christian Dagg)
- Boston Architectural College (Beth Lundell Garver, school representative)
- California College of the Arts (Randolph Ruiz)
- California State University, San Luis Obispo (Mark Cabrinha)
- Carnegie Mellon University (Alexis McCune Secosky)
- City College of New York (Vanesa Alicea)
- Clemson University (Robert Silance)
- Drexel University (Simon Tickell)
- Drury University (Bruce More)
- Florida A&M University (Michael Alfano Jr,)
- Florida International University (Jaime Canaves, school representative)
- Georgia Tech (Stuart Romm)
- Judson University (Sean Gallagher)
- Kansas State University (Michael McGlynn)
- Kennesaw State University (Chris Welty)
- Kent State University - CAED (Jack Hawk)
- Lawrence Technological University (Martin Schwartz)
- Louisiana State University (Robert Holton)
- Louisiana Tech University (Kevin Singh)
- Massachusetts College of Art and Design (Paul Hajian)
- Miami University (Craig Hinrichs)
- Mississippi State University (Alexis Gregory)
- Montana State University (Christopher Livingston)
- New Jersey Institute of Technology (Mark Bess)
- New York Institute of Technology (Barbara Mishara)
- NewSchool of Architecture & Design (Mitra Kanaani)

- North Carolina State University (George Hallowell)
- North Dakota State University (Mark Barnhouse)
- Northeastern University (Lynn Burke)
- Oklahoma State University (Tom Spector)
- Polytechnic University of Puerto Rico (Nelson Rivera, school representative)
- Portland State University (Barbara Sestak)
- Prairie View A&M University (Bruce Bockhorn)
- Pratt Institute (Nicholas Agneta)
- Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (Lonn Combs)
- Rice University (John Casbarian)
- Roger Williams University (Karen Hughes)
- Savannah College of Art and Design - SCAD (Hsu-Jen Huang)
- School of the Art Institute of Chicago (Eric Davis)
- Southern Illinois University (Norm Lach)
- State University of New York at Buffalo (Stephanie Cramer, school representative)
- Syracuse University (Connie Caldwell)
- Texas A&M University (Valerian Miranda)
- Texas Tech University College of Architecture (Darrick Wade)
- Tuskegee University (Roderick Fluker)
- University North Carolina Charlotte (Chris Jarrett, school representative)
- University of Arizona (Brad Lang)
- University of Arkansas (Jonathan Boelkins)
- University of California, Los Angeles (Todd Lynch)
- University of Cincinnati (John Jaskiewicz, school representative)
- University of Colorado Denver (Christopher Nims)
- University of Florida (Frank Bosworth, school representative)
- University of Hawaii at Manoa (Daniel Friedman, school representative)
- University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (Lee Waldrep)
- University of Kansas (Joe Colistra)
- University of Kentucky (Mark O'Bryan)
- University of Louisiana at Lafayette (Ashlie Latiolais)
- University of Massachusetts Amherst (Caryn Brause)
- University of Memphis (Michael Chisamore)
- University of Miami (Jacob Brillhart)
- University of Michigan (Beth Berenter, school representative)
- University of Minnesota (Jim Lutz)
- University of Nebraska (Jeff Day, school representative)
- University of Nevada, Las Vegas (Glenn Nowak)
- University of New Mexico (Kristina Yu)
- University of Notre Dame (John Mellor)
- University of Oregon (Otto Poticha, school representative)
- University of Puerto Rico (Anna L Georas Santos)
- University of Texas at Arlington (Heath MacDonald)
- University of Texas at Austin (Charlton Lewis, school representative)
- University of Texas at San Antonio (James Lewis)
- University of Washington (Ann Marie Borys)

- Virginia Tech (Greg Tew)
- Washington State University (Gregory Kessler)
- Washington University in St. Louis (Chandler Ahrens)
- Wentworth Institute (Charles Cimino)
- Woodbury School of Architecture (Catherine Roussel)

9 universities with candidate-NAAB degree programs in attendance this year:
- Bowling Green State University (Heidi Reger)
- California Baptist University (Caleb Walder)
- Marywood University (Margaret McManus)
- Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico (Pilarin Ferrer, advisor, & Luis V. Badillo, school representative)
- Rochester Institute of Technology (Jules Chiavaroli)
- South Dakota State University (Charles MacBride)
- State University of New York at Alfred State College (William Dean)
- University of Maine (Sanjit Roy, school representative)
- University of the District of Columbia (Ralph Belton, advisor, & Susan Kliman, school representative)

1 school non-NAAB in attendance this year:
- New York City College of Technology (Barbara Mishara)

Historical attendance

7 Schools with NAAB accredited degree programs never in attendance:
- Parsons the New School for Design
- Princeton University
- University of California, Berkeley
- University of Hartford
- University of Illinois - Chicago
- University of Tennessee Knoxville
- University of Wisconsin Milwaukee

10 Schools with NAAB accredited degree programs last attendance 2013 or earlier:
- Arizona State University / last attended 2011
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology / last attended 2010
- Norwich University / last attended 2013
- The Ohio State University / last attended 2013
- Rhode Island School of Design / last attended 2012
- University of Detroit Mercy / last attended 2013
- University of Houston / last attended 2012
- University of South Florida / last attended 2010
- University of Virginia / last attended 2010
- Yale University / last attended 2012

26 Schools with NAAB accredited degree programs not in attendance this year:
- American University of Sharjah

- Ball State University
- California Polytechnic University, Pomona
- Columbia University
- Cornell University
- Florida Atlantic University
- Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture
- Hampton University
- Harvard University
- Howard University
- Illinois Institute of Technology
- Iowa State University
- Morgan State University / No advisor – advisor switched schools
- Pennsylvania State University
- Philadelphia University
- Southern California Institute of Architecture (SCI-Arc)
- Temple University
- The Catholic University of America
- The Cooper Union
- Tulane University
- University of Idaho
- University of Maryland
- University of Oklahoma
- University of Pennsylvania
- University of Southern California
- University of Utah

Attendance reminder emails/letters sent prior to 2016 Summit

8 Schools with NAAB accredited degree programs never in attendance (letter sent by Harry):
- Parsons the New School for Design
- Princeton University
- University of Arizona / Attended 2016 Summit
- University of California, Berkeley
- University of Hartford
- University of Illinois - Chicago
- University of Tennessee Knoxville
- University of Wisconsin Milwaukee

13 Schools with NAAB accredited degree programs last attendance in 2013 or earlier (email by Patricia):
- Arizona State University
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Norwich University
- The Ohio State University
- Rhode Island School of Design
- State University of New York at Buffalo / Attended 2016 Summit
- University of Detroit Mercy
- University of Houston

- University of South Florida
- University of Texas at Arlington/ Attended 2016 Summit
- University of Virginia
- Washington University at St Louis / Attended 2016 Summit
- Yale University

1 School with NAAB accredited degree programs without an advisor and not in attendance since 2013 or earlier (letter sent by Harry):
- University of Hawaii – Manoa / Attended 2016 Summit & Advisor Appointed

Next Steps

1. Reach out and connect with schools that have never attended the Summit from multiple angles:
   a. Staff to connect via phone with licensing advisor and/or school's dean to build rapport and understand why they do not attend. Explain value of attending the summit to the school.
   b. When an outreach visit is planned at one of the schools, set up a meeting with the licensing advisor and/or school dean with the goal of building a relationship.
   c. Follow up with the person contacted via email/letter two months before the Summit.

2. *Recommendation: Add visit to all schools never in attendance to the FY2017 Outreach Plan.*

Current Outreach Plan (FY2017 & FY2018)

Schools with NAAB accredited degree programs never in attendance:
- Parsons the New School for Design
  - Visit currently budgeted for FY17 – planning for this spring
- Princeton University
  - Visit currently budgeted for FY18 – *Currently planning for Oct. 2016 by connecting it with another trip already set up*
- University of California, Berkeley
  - Visit currently budgeted for FY17 – planning for this spring
- University of Hartford
  - Visit currently scheduled in FY17- visit scheduled for September 13, 2016
- University of Illinois – Chicago
  - Visit currently budgeted for FY18 – *may be able to connect it with a trip in Nov. 2016*
- University of Tennessee Knoxville
  - Visit currently budgeted for FY18 visit
  - Tried to schedule a visit August 2016, but advisor passed off the invitation to the dean, who then passed it onto the AIAS faculty advisor, who then passed it off to AIAS chapter

leadership, was not able to get it scheduled. May try again for this spring.

- University of Wisconsin Milwaukee
  - o Visit budgeted for FY18 visit – may try to set up a visit for this spring

Schools with NAAB accredited degree programs last attendance 2013 or earlier:

- Arizona State University / last attended 2011
  - o Visit currently budgeted for FY18 – *may need to schedule a visit in FY17*
- Massachusetts Institute of Technology / last attended 2010
  - o Visit currently budgeted for FY17 – planning for November 2016
- Norwich University / last attended 2013
  - o Visit currently budgeted for FY18
- The Ohio State University / last attended 2013
  - o Visit currently scheduled in FY17 - September 29, 2016
- Rhode Island School of Design / last attended 2012
  - o Visit currently budgeted for FY17 - spring
- University of Detroit Mercy / last attended 2013
  - o Visit currently budgeted for FY18 – *may be able to tie into Harry's trip to Detroit in March 2017*
- University of Houston / last attended 2012
  - o Visit currently budgeted for FY18
- University of South Florida / last attended 2010
  - o Visit currently budgeted for FY18 - *may need to schedule a visit in FY17*
- University of Virginia / last attended 2010
  - o Visit currently budgeted for FY18 - *may need to schedule a visit in FY17*
- Yale University / last attended 2012
  - o Visit currently scheduled in FY17 – visit scheduled for September 13, 2016

Helpful Hints for 2017 Visits

Notes from November 6-7, 2016

Helpful Hints for 2017 Visits

Notes from November 6-7, 2016

Helpful Hints for 2017 Visits

Notes from November 6-7, 2016