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Mission

• The mission of the NAAB is leadership in, and the establishment of, educational quality assurance standards to enhance the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architectural profession.

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

Historical Background
The National Architectural Accrediting Board (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. Among the NAAB’s primary responsibilities are (a) to maintain a list of accredited degree programs in architecture and (b) to maintain statistical information on accredited programs.
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INTRODUCTION

It is my great pleasure and honor to transmit to you, on behalf of the directors and staff of the National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc. (NAAB), the 2010 Report on Accreditation in Architecture Education. The NAAB has developed this report to provide critical data in the following three areas:

- Accreditation actions taken in 2010;
- Aggregated statistics on NAAB-accredited programs; and
- An overview of accreditation-related activities in 2010.

This is the third edition of this report. It presents information on accreditation actions and accredited programs on an annual basis. The decisions represented in this report were all made on the basis of visits and Visiting Team Reports submitted in 2010; these decisions were all effective January 1, 2010. There were a total of 31 accreditation visits in 2010 involving 145 volunteers. The level of commitment from these volunteers is remarkable. The NAAB wishes to express its gratitude to each of them for sharing their time and talent in the critically important work of ensuring the quality of accredited professional degree programs and candidate programs in architecture.

In 1975 the NAAB became responsible for establishing and maintaining “a data bank of comparable information on schools.” This is now fulfilled by the Annual Report Submission (ARS) system. Since 2008, 100% of accredited and candidate programs have submitted statistical data. The charts included in this report are designed to provide aggregated information on programs, students, and faculty. Beginning with the 2010 report, the NAAB is able to compare data year-to-year and note significant changes.

We would also like to acknowledge the considerable efforts of the NAAB-accredited programs in assembling and forwarding to the NAAB the important information encompassed by the ARS.

In conclusion, I hope you agree this report serves as a valuable communications tool that will prove useful to schools of architecture, accredited programs, and the profession. Please feel free to share suggestions for improvements or changes by contacting the NAAB at forum@naab.org.

Thank you for your support,

Kin DuBois, FAIA
President
2010 ACCREDITATION DECISIONS

In 2010, the NAAB made 39 accreditation decisions. Twenty-four programs were reviewed for continuing accreditation and three for initial accreditation. In addition, two programs were reviewed for continuation of candidacy, two programs were reviewed for initial candidacy, and two proposals for new programs were reviewed to determine whether they were eligible for candidacy.

Overall, 145 volunteers (including observers and NAAB Directors) participated on visiting or review teams in 2010.

The NAAB accredits the following professional degree programs: the Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.), the Master of Architecture (M. Arch.), and the Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.).

Six-year term of accreditation (with or without a focused evaluation)
The Cooper Union (B. Arch.) [2016]
Cornell University (B. Arch.) [2016]
Drury University (B. Arch.) [2016]
Mississippi State University (B. Arch. & M. Arch.) [2016]
NewSchool for Architecture and Design (B. Arch. & M. Arch.) [2016]
Parsons the New School for Design (M. Arch.) [2016]
Pratt Institute (B. Arch. & M. Arch.) [2016]
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute (B. Arch. & M. Arch.) [2016]
Rice University (B. Arch. & M. Arch.) [2016]
Syracuse University (B. Arch. & M. Arch.) [2016]
Texas Tech University (M. Arch.) [2016]
University of California at Los Angeles (M. Arch.) [2016]
University of California at Berkeley (M. Arch.) [2016]
University of Idaho (M. Arch.) [2016]
University of Kansas (M. Arch.) [2016]
University of Massachusetts- Amherst (M. Arch.) [2016]
University of North Carolina at Charlotte (B. Arch. & M. Arch.) [2016]
University of Notre Dame (B. Arch. & M. Arch.) [2016]
University of Pennsylvania (M. Arch.) [2016]
University of Texas- Arlington (M. Arch.) [2016]
University of Texas- San Antonio (M. Arch.) [2016]

Three-year term of accreditation
Academy of Art University (M. Arch.) [2013]
Savannah College of Art and Design (M. Arch.) [2013]

Two-year term of accreditation
Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture (M. Arch.) [2012]

Three-Year Term of Initial Accreditation
American University of Sharjah (B. Arch.) [2013]
Southern Illinois University- Carbondale (M. Arch.) [2013]
Cornell University (M. Arch.) [2013]

Continuation of Candidacy
Portland State University (M. Arch.) [initial accreditation expected 2012]
University of Memphis (M. Arch.) [initial accreditation expected 2012]
2010 ACCREDITATION DECISIONS

Initial Candidacy
Woodbury University (M. Arch.) [initial accreditation expected 2012]
Academy of Art University (B. Arch.)- denied

Eligibility for Candidacy
Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico [initial candidacy visit in 2011]
Rochester Institute of Technology [initial candidacy visit in 2012]

2010 ACCREDITATION CYCLE REVIEW – ANALYSIS OF VISITING TEAM REPORTS
During Spring 2010, there were 30 accreditation visits to 29 institutions4
  • Twenty-two were visited for continuing accreditation of at least one accredited program.
  • Three were visited for initial accreditation
  • Two were visited for continuation of candidacy
  • Two were visited for initial candidacy
  • One was visited for eligibility for candidacy.

---

4 Cornell University and Academy of Art University (AAU) were each visited twice. Cornell was visited for continuing accreditation of the B. Arch. and initial accreditation of the M. Arch. AAU was visited for continuing accreditation of the M. Arch. and initial candidacy for the B. Arch.
2010 ACCREDITATION DECISIONS

Because of the unique nature of candidacy visits, these visits have not been included in the analysis of results that appears below.

2004 Conditions for Accreditation 1-12
For the purposes of analyzing VTR results for Conditions 1-12, the analysis is confined to the institution offering the accredited degree programs. Of the 25 institutions offering professional degree programs that were visited for continuing or initial accreditation:
  • One did not meet four of Conditions 1-12.
  • One did not meeting three of Conditions 1-12.
  • Three institutions did not meet two of Conditions 1-12.

Twelve of the 25 institutions Met all of Conditions 1-12.

Of the Conditions for Accreditation (1-12), the following were Not Met by the most number of institutions:
  • 3. Public Information (7)
  • 8. Physical Resources (7)

The following Conditions were Met by all programs:
  • 4. Social Equity
  • 9. Information Resources
  • 11. Administrative Structure

2004 Condition 13 – Student Performance Criteria (SPCs)
For the purposes of analyzing VTR results for Condition 13, all professional degree programs were evaluated. This is because the team has the option to designate an individual SPC as Met in one degree program and Not Met in another.

The average number of Not Met SPC for all programs visited was 3.82. This is an increase of 1.47 over 2009. The increase may, in part, be explained by the number of programs visited for initial candidacy, both of which had a significant number of Not-Yet Met assessments. If the programs visited for initial candidacy are removed, the average becomes 2.54, an increase of only .18.

Of the professional degree programs reviewed for initial accreditation, continuing accreditation or continuation of candidacy, eighteen of the degree programs had three or fewer Not Met SPCs, including one program that had zero Not Met SPC.

The following SPCs were Not Met by the most number of professional degree programs, excluding those visited for initial candidacy:
  • 13.14. Accessibility (12)
  • 13.25. Construction Cost Control (9)
  • 13.26 Technical Documentation (6)
  • 13.28. Comprehensive Design (10)

The remaining SPCs were at most Not Met by seven or fewer professional degree programs, excluding those visited for initial candidacy.

The Board accepted the recommendation of the visiting team in 31 of 39 individual decisions, including those visited for initial candidacy.
2010 ACCREDITATION DECISIONS

FOCUSED EVALUATIONS

As of September 30, 2010, all Focused Evaluation Team Reports were completed and submitted. All seven FEIs were reviewed by the Board at the October 2010 meeting.

- California Polytechnic State University, Pomona (B. Arch. & M. Arch.)
- Georgia Institute of Technology (M. Arch.)
- Iowa State University (B. Arch. & M. Arch.)
- Louisiana State University (B. Arch. & M. Arch.)
- Texas A&M University (M. Arch.)
- University of Kentucky (M. Arch.)
- University of Oregon (B. Arch. & M. Arch.)

In all cases, the date of the next visit was affirmed.

A 2009 focused evaluation for Howard University (B. Arch.) was also completed in fall 2010. The term was affirmed.

2011 ACCREDITATION CYCLE

As of February 20, 2011 there are 30 visits on the schedule for 2011:

- 24 visits for continuing accreditation
- 2 visits for initial accreditation
- 4 visits for initial candidacy

Twenty-four visits are scheduled between January 22 and April 13. Six visits will take place in the fall.
ANNUAL REPORT SUBMISSION (ARS)

Overview
Begun in 2007, the NAAB launched its online Annual Report Submission in fall 2008. The web-based questionnaire has two parts – part I Annual Statistical Report and part II is the narrative. Aggregate results of part I are included in this report.

Part I (annual statistical report) captures statistical information on both the institution in which an architecture program is located and the program itself. Part I consists of seven sections: (1) institutional characteristics, (2) NAAB-accredited architecture programs, (3) tuition, fees, and financial support for students, (4) student characteristics, (5) degrees awarded, (6) resources for students and learning, and (7) human resources.

For part I, the definitions are taken from the glossary of terms used by the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). 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[^4]. Much of the institutional information requested in part I of the ARS corresponds to reports submitted by institutions to IPEDS each fall.

[^4]: Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System http://nces.ed.gov/IPEDS/
ACCREDITED AND CANDIDATE PROGRAMS

Accredited and Candidate Programs (n = 156)

As of the end of 2010, there are 151 accredited programs housed in 119 U.S. institutions with another five programs in candidacy at four additional institutions. Of the 151, 35% (53 programs) offer the Bachelor of Architecture, 64% (97 programs) offer the Master of Architecture and 1% (1 program) offers the Doctor of Architecture. Two programs received initial accreditation in 2010.

Candidate Programs
Of the five programs in candidacy during the 2009-2010 academic year, four were M. Arch. programs and one was a B. Arch. program.

Only one candidate program was offered by an institution that already supports a NAAB-accredited program.
Number of Accredited Programs at Institutions (includes candidates for accredited programs)
There are 123 institutions that offer accredited or candidate architecture programs. Of those 123, 92 (73%) offer one accredited program, and 31 (27%) offer two accredited programs.

The number of institutions with two accredited programs dropped from 34 in 2009 to 31 in 2010 because of the phase-out of degree programs that underwent nomenclature changes.

Institution Type:
Of those 123 institutions, 74 (60%) are public institutions, 47 (38%) are private not-for-profit institutions, and 2 (2%) are private for-profit institutions.
ACCREDITED PROGRAMS—ENROLLMENT

Overall Enrollment by Degree (N=27,852)
There are 27,852 students enrolled in NAAB-accredited degree programs; of this total, 16,493 (59%) are enrolled in Bachelor of Architecture programs, 11,009 (40%) in Master of Architecture programs, and 350 (1%) in Doctor of Architecture degree programs.

Of the 27,852 students enrolled, 25,623 (91%) are enrolled full-time, and 2,229 (8%) are enrolled part-time.

Enrollment increased by 7.7% from 2009, when there were 25,707 students enrolled in accredited degree programs. The percentage breakdowns for enrollment among degree programs did not change from those of 2009.

There are 15,060 (55%) architecture students enrolled in institutions with public support and 12,792 (45%) in institutions with private support. In 2009 the percentage breakdown between public and private institutions was 50–50.
Overall Enrollment by Gender - Accredited Programs
The gender breakdown of students enrolled is approximately 60/40 with 16,424 (59%) male students and 11,428 (41%) female. The percentages for male/female enrollment remain unchanged from those of 2009 and are statistically the same for the three degrees, Bachelor of Architecture, Master of Architecture, and Doctor of Architecture.
Overall Enrollment by Ethnicity—Accredited Programs

There are 14,403 (52%) architecture students who indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories were as follows: 123 (1%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 2,878 (10%) Asian; 79 (0.03%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 1,484 (5%) Black or African American; 3,763 (14%) Hispanic/Latino; 291 (1%) two or more races; 2,992 (7%) nonresident alien; and 2,829 (10%) race and ethnicity unknown.

The percentages of overall enrollment by ethnicity by degree are different.

- For the Bachelor of Architecture, 34.7% of students were minorities (American Indian or Alaskan Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; Black, Non-Hispanic; Hispanic/Latino) compared to 29.9% overall.
- For the Master of Architecture: 21.4% were minorities compared to 30% for the overall enrollment.
- For the Doctor of Architecture, minorities represent 70% of enrollment.
Distribution of Accredited Programs and Enrolled Students by ACSA Region

The Northeast region is home to the greatest number of accredited programs with 34 (28%).

Two programs were granted initial accreditation in 2010: the American University of Sharjah is part of the Northeast region and Southern Illinois University-Carbondale is in the West Central region.

The table below shows the number of full- and part-time students enrolled in accredited degree programs by ACSA region. This table does not include candidate programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Programs</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Arch.</td>
<td>M. Arch.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Central</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Regions</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERALL ENROLLMENT IN CANDIDATE PROGRAMS

Overall Enrollment by Degree (n=573)
Of the 573 students enrolled in candidate programs during 2009–2010, 282 (49%) were enrolled in a B. Arch. program and 291 (51%) in an M. Arch. program. There are no D. Arch. candidate programs.
OVERALL ENROLLMENT IN CANDIDATE PROGRAMS

Overall Enrollment by Gender- Candidate Programs
The gender breakdown of students enrolled in candidate programs is approximately 60/40 with 348 (61%) male students and 225 (39%) female. The percentages for male/female enrollment remain statistically the same for the two degree types.

- The gender distribution for B. Arch. programs is 63% male students and 37% female students
- The gender distribution for M. Arch. program is 59% male and 41% female. This is statistically the same as for accredited M. Arch. programs.
Overall Enrollment by Ethnicity-- Candidate Programs

In candidate programs, there are 417 (73%) architecture students who indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories were as follows: 0 (0%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 29 (5%) Asian; 0 (0%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 13 (2%) Black or African American; 44 (8%) Hispanic/Latino; 4 (0.7%) two or more races; 46 (8%) nonresident alien; and 20 (3%) race and ethnicity unknown.
First-time Enrollment in Accredited Programs (n=8,653 / 27,852)
There were 8,653 newly matriculated students enrolled in NAAB-accredited degree programs for the academic year 2009–2010. The number of new students is approximately one-third of all students in accredited programs. Of this total, 4,091 (47%) are enrolled in Bachelor of Architecture programs, 4,474 (51%) in Master of Architecture programs, and 88 (1%) in Doctor of Architecture degree programs.

Of the 8,653 newly enrolled students, 8,213 (93%) are enrolled full-time and 440 (7%) part-time. There are 4,839 (58%) architecture students enrolled in institutions with public support and 3,814 (42%) enrolled in institutions with private support.

First-Time Enrollment by Gender
The gender breakdown of students enrolled is approximately 60/40 with 5,116 (59%) male students and 3,537 (41%) female. These percentages have not changed from those recorded in 2009. In addition, the percentages for male/female are relatively the same for the three degrees, Bachelor of Architecture, Master of Architecture, and Doctor of Architecture.

First-Time Enrollment by Ethnicity
There are 4,418 (51%) architecture students who indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories were as follows: 36 (0.4%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 755 (8.7%) Asian; 21 (0.2%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 530 (6.1%) Black or African American; 936 (11%) Hispanic/Latino; 106 (1%) two or more races; 681 (8%) nonresident alien; and 1,170 (13%) race and ethnicity unknown.
DEGREES AWARDED

Degrees Awarded by Accredited Programs (n=6,017)
A total of 6,017 accredited degrees were awarded during the 2009–2010 academic year: 2,596 (43%) were Bachelor of Architecture degrees; 3,394 (56%) were Master of Architecture degrees; and 27 (0.4%) were Doctor of Architecture degrees.
Degrees Awarded by Gender
The gender breakdown for degrees awarded was comparable to that of the gender breakdown for overall enrollment: 3,444 (57%) males and 2,573 (43%) females. With the exception of the Doctor of Architecture, the percentages of degrees awarded for male/female are statistically the same for the degrees of Bachelor of Architecture and Master of Architecture.
Degrees Awarded by Ethnicity
Of the degrees awarded, 3,680 (61%) were awarded to White, Non-Hispanic candidates with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories are as follows: 29 (1%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 481 (8%) Asian; 7 (0.12%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 254 (4%) Black or African American; 546 (9%) Hispanic/Latino; 40 (0.66%) two or more races; 402 (7%) nonresident alien; and 578 (9.6%) race and ethnicity unknown.

In the case of ethnicity, the percentage of degrees awarded was less than the overall enrollment with the exception of White, Non-Hispanic. With the exception of the Doctor of Architecture, the percentages of degrees awarded for ethnicity are statistically the same for the degrees of Bachelor of Architecture and Master of Architecture.
PREPROFESSIONAL DEGREES—ENROLLMENT

Overall Enrollment in Preprofessional Programs
Of the institutions that offer accredited architecture programs, 82 offer preprofessional programs. The term preprofessional refers to architecturally focused four-year degrees that are not accredited by NAAB. These degrees have such titles as B.S. in Architecture, B.S. in Architectural Studies, B.A. in Architecture, Bachelor of Environmental Design, or Bachelor of Architectural Studies. The amount of architectural content in the program may vary from institution to institution.

There are 17,342 students enrolled in preprofessional degree programs; of the total, 16,284 (93%) are enrolled full-time and 1,148 (7%) part-time. There are 12,365 (71%) preprofessional students enrolled in institutions with public support and 5,067 (29%) in institutions with private support.

Preprofessional Enrollment by Gender
The gender breakdown of students enrolled is approximately 65/35 with 11,264 (65%) male students and 6,168 (35%) female students.

Preprofessional Enrollment by Ethnicity
There are 9,922 (57%) preprofessional architecture students who indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories are as follows: 81 (0.46%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 853 (5%) Asian; 11 (0.06%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 1,169 (7%) Black or African American; 2,087 (12%) Hispanic/Latino; 81 (0.5%) two or more races; 631 (4%) nonresident alien; and 2,597 (15%) race and ethnicity unknown.

First-Time Enrollment in Preprofessional Programs
There were 5,492 newly matriculated students enrolled in preprofessional programs at institutions with accredited architecture programs for the academic year 2009–2010; 5,278 (96%) were enrolled full-time and 214 (4%) were enrolled part-time. There were 3,800 (70%) architecture students enrolled in institutions with public support and 1,692 (30%) in institutions with private support.

First-Time Enrollment by Gender
The gender breakdown of students enrolled is approximately 65/35 with 3,425 (62%) male students and 2,067 (38%) female.

First-Time Enrollment by Ethnicity
There are 3,041 (55%) preprofessional students who indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories were as follows: 13 (0.24%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 319 (6%) Asian; 23 (0.42%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 409 (7%) Black, Non-Hispanic; 617 (11%) Hispanic/Latino; 26 (0.5%) two or more races; 187 (3%) nonresident alien; and 857 (15%) race and ethnicity unknown.
PREPROFESSIONAL PROGRAMS—DEGREES AWARDED

A total of 3,430 preprofessional degrees were awarded during the 2009–2010 academic year.

Degrees Awarded—Gender
The gender breakdown of degrees awarded is approximately 60/40 with 2,107 (61%) degrees awarded to male students and 1,323 (39%) to female students.

Degrees Awarded—Ethnicity
There were 2,136 (62%) degrees awarded to students who indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories were as follows: 18 (0.5%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 234 (7%) Asian; 5 (0.15%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 192 (6%) Black or African American; 391 (11%) Hispanic/Latino; 31 (1%) two or more races; 90 (3%) nonresident alien; and 333 (10%) race and ethnicity unknown.

POSTPROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS
In addition to offering NAAB-accredited programs, 72 institutions offer postprofessional degree programs in architecture. The term postprofessional refers to graduate degrees offered to students who already have a professional degree in architecture. These degree programs are not accredited by NAAB. They may be in highly specialized areas of study such as design theory, health care facilities, preservation, interior design, or solar design. Postprofessional degrees are offered at the master’s or, in a few cases, doctoral level. This is an increase of 4 since the 2008-2009 academic year.

California State Polytechnic University at San Luis Obispo Team Room. Photo by Tom Fowler, IV, AIA, NCARB
Total Faculty—Status
There are 5,642 faculty teaching in NAAB-accredited degree programs. This number is relatively unchanged from 2009. Of this total, 2,343 (42%) are full-time, 804 (14%) are part-time, and 2,495 (44%) are adjunct.
Faculty—Gender
The gender breakdown of faculty is approximately 76/26 with 4,150 (74%) male faculty and 1,492 (26%) female. This is unchanged from the 2008–2009 academic year.

When viewing the percentages by rank,
• For full and associate professors the distribution by gender is statistically the same: 75/25
• For assistant professors the distribution is 67/34.
• For instructors, the distribution is 71/29.

[Pie chart showing gender distribution: 74% Male, 26% Female]
Faculty—Rank
Of the total faculty, 998 (18%) are full professors, 997 (18%) are associate professors, 1,184 (21%) are assistant professors, and 2,463 (40%) are instructors.

The distribution across faculty ranks remains largely the same as in 2009. In 2009, 19% were full professors, 18% were associate professors, 20% were assistant professors, and 44% were instructors.
Facility—Ethnicity
There were 4,486 (79%) faculty members that indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining indicated the following: 5 (0.21%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 375 (7%) Asian; 7 (0.17%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 160 (3%) Black, Non-Hispanic; 375 (7%) Hispanic/Latino; 21 (0.37%) two or more races; 64 (1.5%) nonresident alien; and 149 (3%) race and ethnicity unknown.

When considering the status of the faculty (full-time, part-time, and adjunct), the percentages are much the same as for the overall faculty.

There are more minority faculty at the assistant professor and instructor level.
Credentials for Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors
Based on data supplied by the architecture programs for the 2009–2010 academic year, 3,179 individuals are employed as assistant, associate, or full professors.

Of that number, 1,477 (46%) have an accredited M. Arch. degree.
Assistant, Associate, and Full Professors Registered in a U.S. Jurisdiction

Of the total number of assistant, associate, and full professors, 934 (29.4%) are registered to practice in a U.S. jurisdiction.

Assistant professors are registered at a significantly higher rate (37.3%) than associate professors (23.5%) or full professors (25.9%).
FACULTY SALARIES

National Averages
As to be expected, the salary range for full professor exceeded that of associate professor, which, in turn, exceeded that of assistant professor.

The national salary range of averages for full professor is $72,651 to $104,960 with an average salary of $86,845. The national salary range of averages for associate professor is $59,349 to $88,560 with an average salary of $67,998. The national salary range of averages for assistant professor is $48,942 to $61,483 with an average salary of $55,199.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$72,651</td>
<td>$104,960</td>
<td>$86,845</td>
<td>$74,035</td>
<td>$104,814</td>
<td>$87,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$59,349</td>
<td>$88,560</td>
<td>$67,998</td>
<td>$57,720</td>
<td>$76,047</td>
<td>$65,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$48,942</td>
<td>$61,483</td>
<td>$55,199</td>
<td>$49,049</td>
<td>$59,895</td>
<td>$53,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$16,900</td>
<td>$25,946</td>
<td>$20,262</td>
<td>$17,719</td>
<td>$27,790</td>
<td>$21,374</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing Public and Private Institutions
Generally, national averages for salaries at public institutions are higher than at private institutions. This is true not only in architecture but for university averages as well.

In the case of public institutions, university averages exceeded program averages, except for associate professors. In private institutions, program averages exceeded university averages, except at the instructor level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>University Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$75,137</td>
<td>$113,180</td>
<td>$91,738</td>
<td>$94,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$62,090</td>
<td>$100,400</td>
<td>$72,292</td>
<td>$68,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$51,398</td>
<td>$66,558</td>
<td>$58,969</td>
<td>$60,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$21,216</td>
<td>$32,278</td>
<td>$25,279</td>
<td>$26,510</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>University Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$68,973</td>
<td>$92,793</td>
<td>$79,603</td>
<td>$72,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$55,292</td>
<td>$71,036</td>
<td>$61,643</td>
<td>$52,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$45,308</td>
<td>$53,971</td>
<td>$49,621</td>
<td>$44,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$10,514</td>
<td>$16,576</td>
<td>$12,837</td>
<td>$16,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY SALARIES

Averages by ACSA Region
The highest regional average for full professor is in the Northeast region at $95,122. The highest average for associate professor is in the Southwest region at $73,936. The highest average for assistant professor is in the West Central region at $59,414. The highest regional average for instructor is also in the Southwest region at $29,488.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>University Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Faculty - Northeast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$81,728</td>
<td>$110,164</td>
<td>$95,122</td>
<td>$91,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$64,905</td>
<td>$83,170</td>
<td>$73,025</td>
<td>$65,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$52,396</td>
<td>$61,566</td>
<td>$57,113</td>
<td>$53,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$10,584</td>
<td>$12,148</td>
<td>$11,154</td>
<td>$14,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Faculty - Southeast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$61,461</td>
<td>$91,212</td>
<td>$74,855</td>
<td>$82,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$54,890</td>
<td>$76,242</td>
<td>$63,457</td>
<td>$63,337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$42,166</td>
<td>$56,823</td>
<td>$50,492</td>
<td>$54,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$18,949</td>
<td>$34,394</td>
<td>$23,496</td>
<td>$27,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Faculty - Southwest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$73,433</td>
<td>$112,889</td>
<td>$87,766</td>
<td>$86,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$62,063</td>
<td>$88,698</td>
<td>$73,936</td>
<td>$60,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$49,820</td>
<td>$61,155</td>
<td>$54,276</td>
<td>$54,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$22,937</td>
<td>$44,253</td>
<td>$29,488</td>
<td>$30,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Faculty - West</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$69,978</td>
<td>$103,054</td>
<td>$85,380</td>
<td>$89,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$54,256</td>
<td>$114,969</td>
<td>$61,479</td>
<td>$62,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$48,775</td>
<td>$61,646</td>
<td>$54,914</td>
<td>$57,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$20,905</td>
<td>$32,277</td>
<td>$26,297</td>
<td>$27,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Faculty - West Central</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$74,038</td>
<td>$100,817</td>
<td>$85,893</td>
<td>$89,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$61,571</td>
<td>$82,836</td>
<td>$71,057</td>
<td>$66,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$53,835</td>
<td>$68,285</td>
<td>$59,414</td>
<td>$56,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$14,742</td>
<td>$17,938</td>
<td>$16,455</td>
<td>$20,267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Faculty - East Central</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$71,378</td>
<td>$119,639</td>
<td>$90,129</td>
<td>$64,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$57,368</td>
<td>$78,676</td>
<td>$66,549</td>
<td>$48,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$44,360</td>
<td>$59,924</td>
<td>$53,943</td>
<td>$41,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$19,897</td>
<td>$30,363</td>
<td>$24,049</td>
<td>$20,255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Team Training and Orientation
In October 2010, the NAAB launched its online training system at http://training.naab.org. The system supports five modules. Each module includes a recorded PowerPoint presentation (with audio) and supplemental materials in PDF. Every module also includes a quiz. Participants must correctly answer four of five questions. The quiz questions are randomly selected from a pool of twenty questions developed for each module. Students must pass the quiz in order to earn credit for the module.

The online modules address basic information.
1. Introduction to the NAAB
2. The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Part I
3. The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Part II
5. Visit Protocols

Beginning with the 2010 AIA National Convention, the face-to-face training for all potential team members was redesigned as a three-hour workshop that includes:

- Interpersonal dynamics (intra-team, between the team and program, etc.) – conducted through role play simulation and small-group interaction
- Case study discussions of past (blinded) site visits – conducted through small-group discussions
- Evaluation of well-written and marginal Visiting Team Reports – conducted through small-group breakout discussions

The new workshop was also delivered at the annual meeting of the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards, the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture Administrators Conference, and the American Institute of Architecture Students FORUM.

The workshop for team chairs took place on November 14 in Washington, DC. Only those chairs scheduled to lead a visit in the following cycle were invited to attend, as were a small group of alternates and team chair mentors. The team chair program included:
- Case study discussions of past (blinded) site visits
- Leadership skills and how to effectively run a site visit
- Interpersonal dynamics, particularly from a team chair’s perspective
- How to handle challenging situations with the program under review
- Writing the Visiting Team Report
- A discussion of the team room and its contents
- Effective communication with the team
- Preparing yourself—and the team—for the site visit
OTHER ACTIVITIES IN 2010

Effective with the 2011 visit cycle, training is mandatory for all volunteers before their first site visit, although the requirement may be waived if necessary. There also will be annual review requirements in subsequent years for team members and team chairs.

As modifications are made to the Procedures or other materials, additional, supplemental modules will be developed. These must also be completed before an individual can be assigned to a visit. Team chair training will take place annually.

At the end of December 2010, the NAAB became an approved CES Provider for the AIA. The online training program has been submitted for approval for 2 CES credits.

Preparation for the 2013 Accreditation Review Conference (ARC13)
During the 2008 Accreditation Review Conference (ARC), the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) identified internal and external evaluation as a critical component of its accreditation model. Initially proposed in June 2008, internal and external evaluation eventually was described as follows:

“Finally, the … NAAB must establish practices for assessment and evaluation of its own effectiveness. Therefore, two new assessment mechanisms have been added
• an internal self assessment process that replaces periodic assessment events with a continuous improvement process still leading to periodic changes in conditions at controlled intervals; and
• an external assessment process incorporating the best practices and guidelines from organizations such as the International Network for Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE) and other agencies that view the NAAB as a quality control agency within a global context.”

The Assessment and Evaluation Committee, established in 2009, is responsible for ensuring that the following areas are addressed through the internal and external evaluation processes:

• Making decisions using data and verifiable information rather than responding to case-by-case problems or concerns.
• Moving toward greater consistency in reports and visit experiences
• Maintaining and improving upon the annual met/not-met analysis.
• Assessing team performance from a variety of perspectives
• Looking ahead to the next review of the Conditions in 2013.
• Scanning collateral organizations’ priorities for the future

During 2009, the committee focused its attention on improving NAAB team training. The result of their work is the new training program.

During 2010 and 2011, the committee will focus on preparations for the next Accreditation Review Conference in 2013 (ARC13). One of the central activities during this period of research and analysis is a study of architecture education.

The study is intended to serve as the NAAB’s foundational reference for the review of the Conditions that begins in 2013. It is expected that other research and analysis will be undertaken during this period, which will be the responsibility of the NAAB staff working at the direction of the committee. It is also expected that the collateral organizations will conduct their own preparatory activities as they have in the past.
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The overall purpose of the study is to create a result that is objective and respected by the NAAB Directors, leaders from the collateral organizations, and others interested in the question of education and architecture. The intent is to repeat the study every five years as part of the cycle of research and preparation for the regularly scheduled review of the Conditions.

The study has two distinct phases. The first consists of qualitative research conducted through a series of nine focus groups (see below). This phase is designed to identify questions and areas of inquiry for further study in the quantitative research phase. The nine focus groups are described in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience/number of focus groups</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students currently enrolled in NAAB-accredited programs (1)</td>
<td>AIAS FORUM Toronto, ON</td>
<td>12/30/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; Administrators in Academic Programs (1)</td>
<td>ACSA Annual Meeting, Montreal, Quebec</td>
<td>3/6/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicing Architects – with interns and without (2)</td>
<td>AIA Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>5/12-14/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural interns (1)</td>
<td>AIA Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>5/12-14/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-traditional professionals in architecture (1)</td>
<td>AIA Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>5/12-14/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-represented populations in architecture (2)</td>
<td>AIA Annual Meeting, New Orleans, LA</td>
<td>5/12-14/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architect members of state registration boards (1)</td>
<td>NCARB Annual Meeting, Washington, DC</td>
<td>6/22-25/2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second phase consists of quantitative research conducted through an electronic survey in late 2011. The survey will be designed to capture demographic information so answers can be studied according to audience segments, while identifying variances and consistencies between segments. Further, the instrument(s) will be developed to ensure the right segments receive the right questions and to allow for the desired analysis in the last stage. The results of the full study will be presented to the NAAB early in 2012.

In addition to the study, the committee, with input from the full Board, is identifying additional areas of study for the next two years. These include analyzing data collected in the ARS to identify trends in enrollment, graduation rates, finances, and faculty, as well as analysis of trends in higher education such as funding models, collaboration with community colleges, and shifts in faculty worklife. The purpose of the broader analysis is to identify the drivers of change in higher education in order to ensure The 2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation will be sufficiently flexible to respond to the effect such changes may have on accredited education in architecture.

Finally, the NAAB has been designated as the monitor for the ARC13 master calendar. This calendar tracks the activities of all five collateral organizations in preparation for ARC13. The NAAB has established January 31, 2013 as the final deadline for submission of all materials to be considered in preparation for and during the conference. The conference itself is tentatively scheduled for July 2013. There will be two full 90-day public comment periods between August 2013 and July 2014. The next edition of The NAAB Conditions for Accreditation will be approved in July 2014. They will go into effect for all visits scheduled after January 1, 2016.
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