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VISION, MISSION, AND VALUES OF THE NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD

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.

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.

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.

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 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 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 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 nontraditional 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.
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.
INTRODUCTION

On behalf of the directors and staff of the National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc. (NAAB), it is my pleasure to transmit the 2011 Report on Accreditation in Architecture Education. The NAAB has developed this report with three purposes in mind:

• To summarize the accreditation actions taken in 2011
• To report aggregated statistics on NAAB-accredited programs
• To outline other accreditation-related activities in 2011

The report 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 2011; these decisions were all effective January 1, 2011. This report does not include the results of six decisions made in February 2012; these were based on visits conducted between October 1 and November 30, 2011. The reconsideration period had not ended at the time this report was prepared.

There were a total of 30 accreditation visits in 2011 involving 125 volunteers, who contributed almost 5,000 hours to the NAAB. These numbers do not include visits for eligibility for candidacy. 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 assuring 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 responsibility is now fulfilled by the Annual Report Submission system (ARS). 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. Where there have been significant changes since 2010, they have been noted in the report.

I hope you agree this report serves as a valuable tool and is useful to the schools of architecture, the 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,

Keelan P. Kaiser, AIA
President
2011 ACCREDITATION DECISIONS

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

The spring visits began on January 22 and concluded on April 13. There were
- 22 visits for continuing accreditation (one was terminated)
- 1 visit for initial accreditation
- 1 visit for initial candidacy

The following terms of accreditation were approved at the February and July 2011 meetings.

Six-year term of continuing accreditation (with or without a focused evaluation)
- Auburn University (B. Arch.)
- California College of the Arts (B. Arch. and M. Arch.)
- CalPoly, San Luis Obispo (B. Arch.)
- Kansas State University (M. Arch.)
- Florida International University (M. Arch.)
- Florida Atlantic University (B. Arch.)
- Morgan State University (M. Arch.)
- Louisiana Tech University (M. Arch.)
- New York Institute of Technology (B. Arch.)
- Norwich University (M. Arch.)
- Ohio State University (M. Arch.)
- Oklahoma State University (B. Arch.)
- Temple University (B. Arch. and M. Arch. [nomenclature change; still in transition])
- Tuskegee University (B. Arch.)
- University of Arizona (B. Arch.)
- University of Hartford (M. Arch.)
- University of Maryland (M. Arch.)
- University of Miami (B. Arch. and M. Arch.)
- University of Michigan (M. Arch.)
- University of South Florida (M. Arch.)
- University of Nevada-Las Vegas (M. Arch.)
- University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (M. Arch.)

Three-year term of initial accreditation
- School of the Art Institute of Chicago (M. Arch.)

Initial candidacy
- Pontificia Católica Universidad de Puerto Rico (B. Arch.)

Eligibility for candidacy
- Academy of Art University (B. Arch.)
- South Dakota State University (M. Arch.)
- University of the District of Columbia (M. Arch.)
2011 ACCREDITATION DECISIONS

There were five visits in the fall of 2011:
• 3 visits for continuing accreditation (Clemson, CCNY, USC)
• 1 visit for initial accreditation (Massachusetts College of the Arts)
• 1 visit for initial candidacy (RIT)

The results of these decisions will be publicly available after April 1, 2012.

By the time the 2011 visit cycle ended in mid-November, the NAAB fielded 30 teams to review 34 individual degree programs. Approximately 125 volunteers contributed 5,000 hours to the work of the NAAB.

In late December 2011, the NAAB received three additional applications for candidacy. Eligibility visits were conducted early in 2012.
• Marywood University (PA)
• University of Maine, Augusta
• Bowling Green State University (OH)

2011 Accreditation Cycle Review—Analysis of Visiting Team Reports from 2011 Spring Visits
During spring 2011, NAAB teams completed visits to 24 institutions and reviewed 27 degree programs for continuing or initial accreditation or initial candidacy.
• 22 were visited for continuing accreditation of at least one accredited program
• One was visited for initial accreditation
• Two were visited for initial candidacy

Because of the unique nature of initial candidacy visits, these visits have not been included in the analysis of results that appears below.
2011 ACCREDITATION DECISIONS

The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Part I, Sections 1-4 and Part II, Sections 2-4
For the purposes of analyzing VTR results for most of the 2009 Conditions, the analysis is confined to the institution offering the accredited degree programs. Of the 22 institutions offering professional degree programs that completed visits for continuing or initial accreditation:
• One did not meet three of Conditions I.1-I.4 or II.2-II.4.
• Five did not meet two of Conditions I.1-I.4 or II.2-II.4.

Ten of the 23 institutions Met all of Conditions I.1-I.4 or II.2-II.4.

Of the Conditions for Accreditation I.1-I.4 and II.2-II.4, the following Condition was Not Met by the greatest number of institutions:
• II.2.1 Statement on NAAB Accredited Degrees (5)

The following Conditions were Met by all programs:
• I.1.1 History and Mission
• I.1.2 Learning Culture and Social Equity
• I.1.3.B Architectural Education and Students
• I.1.3.C Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment
• I.1.3.D Architectural Education and the Profession
• I.1.3.E Architectural Education and the Public Good
• I.2.2 Administrative Structure
• I.2.5 Information Resources
• I.3.3 Faculty Credentials
• II.2.1 Regional Accreditation
• II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development
• II.3 Evaluation of Preparatory and Preprofessional Education
• II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
• II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information

2009 Condition II.1 – Student Performance Criteria (SPCs)
For the purposes of analyzing VTR results for Condition II.1, 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 3.1. However, this includes those programs visited for initial candidacy, where SPC may be assessed as Not-Yet Met.

If the programs visited for initial candidacy are removed, the average becomes 1.33, a decrease compared to 2010 of 1.21.

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” SPC, including one program that had zero Not-Met SPC.
One program, visited for initial accreditation, had seven Not-Met SPC. This is not unusual for programs in the early stages of accreditation.

The following SPC were Not Met by the greatest number of professional degree programs, excluding those visited for initial candidacy:
- A.4 Technical Documentation (4)
- B.2 Accessibility (7)
- B.6 Comprehensive Design (6)

The follow SPC were Met by all programs:
- A.2 Design Thinking Skills
- A.3 Visual Communication Skills
- A.6 Fundamental Design Skills
- A.8 Ordering Systems Skills
- A.11 Applied Research
- B.1 Pre-Design
- B.9 Structural Systems
- C.3 Client Role in Architecture
- C.4 Project Management
- C.6 Leadership
- C.7 Legal Responsibilities
- C.9 Community and Social Responsibility

The Board noted a significant improvement in the quality and clarity of the Visiting Team Reports. This was attributed to the new training for team members and team chairs and the emphasis on preparing VTRs in those workshops.

2011 Focused Evaluations
At its October meeting, the NAAB made decisions on focused evaluations of professional degree programs offered by the following institutions. In all decisions the term was allowed to stand.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M. Arch.) [2015]
University of Arkansas (B. Arch.) [2014]
University of Detroit-Mercy (M. Arch.) [2014]
University of Louisiana Lafayette (M. Arch.) [2014]
Woodbury University (B. Arch.) [2014]

Also, the directors approved a program change for the Doctor of Architecture offered by the University of Hawaii, Manoa.
ANNUAL REPORT SUBMISSION (ARS)

Overview
The NAAB launched its online Annual Report Submission site in fall 2008. The web-based questionnaire has two parts: Part I is the 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.

The definitions in part I 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 United States in areas including enrollments, program completions, graduation rates, faculty, staff, finances, institutional prices, and student financial aid. Much of the institutional information requested in part I of the ARS corresponds to reports submitted by institutions to IPEDS each fall.

---

1 Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System http://nces.ed.gov/IPEDS/
ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

Accredited Programs (n = 151)
As of the end of the 2010–2011 academic year, there are 151 accredited programs housed in 120 U.S. institutions with another five programs in candidacy at four additional institutions.

Of the 151, 34% (51 programs) are Bachelor of Architecture programs, 65% (99 programs) are Master of Architecture programs, and 1% (1 program) is a Doctor of Architecture. Three programs received initial accreditation between July 1, 2010, and June 30, 2011.

Candidate Programs
Of the five programs in candidacy during the 2010–2011 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.
ACCREDITED PROGRAMS

Number of Accredited Programs at Institutions (includes candidates for accredited programs)
There are 120 institutions that offer accredited architecture programs. Of those, 89 (74%) offer one accredited program, and 31 (26%) offer two accredited programs.

Institutions (# of accredited degrees)

- 74% (Institutions with single accredited program)
- 26% (Institutions with two accredited program)

Institution Type

Of those 120 institutions, 72 (60%) are public institutions, 46 (38.3%) are private not-for-profit institutions, and 2 (1.6%) are private for-profit institutions.
Distribution of Accredited Programs and Enrolled Students by ACSA Region

The Northeast region is home to the greatest number of accredited programs with 41 (27.1%).

One program was granted initial accreditation in July 2011: The School of the Art Institute of Chicago is in the West Central region.

The table below shows the total number of 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>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Central</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Regions</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENROLLMENT

Overall Enrollment by Degree in Accredited Programs (N=27,477)
There are 24,478 students enrolled in NAAB-accredited degree programs; of this total, 16,077 (59%) are enrolled in Bachelor of Architecture programs, 11,031 (40%) in Master of Architecture programs, and 370 (1%) in Doctor of Architecture programs.

Of the 27,478 students enrolled, 24,830 (91%) are enrolled full-time, and 2,648 (9%) are enrolled part-time.

Enrollment decreased by 1.1% from the previous academic year (2009–2010), when there were 27,852 students enrolled in accredited degree programs. The distribution of enrolled students across degree programs has not changed since 2009.

There are 14,936 (54.4%) architecture students enrolled in institutions with public support, and 12,541 (46.6%) are enrolled in institutions with private support. In 2010 the distribution of enrolled students between public and private institutions was similar (55-45).

Total Enrollment by Degree Type
Overall Enrollment by Gender in Accredited Programs
The gender breakdown of students enrolled is approximately 60/40 with 16,274 (59%) male students and 11,202 (41%) female. The percentages for male/female enrollment remain unchanged from those of 2010 and are statistically the same for the three degrees, Bachelor of Architecture, Master of Architecture, and Doctor of Architecture.
ENROLLMENT

Overall Enrollment by Ethnicity in Accredited Programs
There are 14,126 (51%) architecture students who indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories were as follows: 130 (0.5%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 2,714 (10%) Asian; 101 (0.4%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 1,444 (5.3%) Black or African American; 3,897 (14.2%) Hispanic/Latino; 424 (1.5%) two or more races; 2,288 (8.3%) nonresident alien; and 2,353 (8.6%) race and ethnicity unknown.

The enrollment by ethnicity for individual degree programs differs:
• For the Bachelor of Architecture, 34.8% of students were minorities (American Indian or Alaskan Native; Asian; Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; Black, Non-Hispanic; Hispanic/Latino) compared to 30% overall.
• For the Master of Architecture, 22.1% of students were minorities compared to 30% for the overall enrollment.
• For the Doctor of Architecture, minorities represent 68.6% of enrollment.
• The Master of Architecture has the highest percentage of students whose race/ethnicity is unknown.
• The Doctor of Architecture has the highest percentage of students who indicated non-resident aliens.

Generally speaking, the distribution of students by ethnicity has not changed significantly since 2009.

Total Enrollment by Ethnicity
Overall Enrollment in Candidate Programs by Degree (n=365)
Of the 365 students enrolled in candidate programs in 2010–2011, 230 (63%) were enrolled in a B.Arch. program and 135 (37%) in an M.Arch. program. There are no D.Arch. candidate programs.

This represents a drop in total enrollment in candidate programs of 208, or 36%. The decline can be partially attributed to the number of students enrolled in programs that have achieved initial accreditation and are no longer reported in this category.
Overall Enrollment in Candidate Programs by Gender
The gender breakdown of students enrolled in candidate programs is approximately 70/30 with 251 (69%) male students and 114 (31%) female students. The percentages for male/female enrollment remain statistically the same for the two degree types.
ENROLLMENT

Overall Enrollment in Candidate Programs by Ethnicity
In candidate programs, there are 74 (20%) architecture students who indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories were as follows: 2 (0.5%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 11 (3%) Asian; 0 (0%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 8 (1%) Black or African American; 242 (67%) Hispanic/Latino; 5 (1.4%) two or more races; 22 (6%) nonresident alien; and 1 (0.3%) race and ethnicity unknown.

The increase in the number of students in candidate programs that indicated Hispanic/Latino is largely due to the fact that the Pontifical Catholic University of Puerto Rico in Ponce achieved initial candidacy during the 2010–2011 academic year and is reporting its students for the first time.
ENROLLMENT

First-Time Enrollment in Accredited Programs (N = 8,307/27,478)
There are 8,307 newly matriculated students enrolled in NAAB-accredited degree programs for the academic year 2010–2011. The number of new students is approximately one-third of all students in accredited programs. Of this total, 3,905 (47%) are enrolled in Bachelor of Architecture programs, 4,283 (51.6%) in Master of Architecture programs, and 119 (1.4%) in Doctor of Architecture degree programs.

Of the 8,307 newly enrolled students, 7,854 (94.5%) are enrolled full-time and 543 (5.5%) are enrolled part-time. There are 4,532 (54.6%) architecture students enrolled in institutions with public support and 3,775 (45.4%) enrolled in institutions with private support.

First-Time Enrollment by Gender
The gender breakdown of students enrolled is approximately 60/40 with 4,953 (59.6%) male students and 3,354 (40.4%) 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 4,212 (50.7%) architecture students who indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories were as follows: 55 (0.7%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 739 (8.9%) Asian; 38 (0.5%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 425 (5.1%) Black or African American; 985 (11.9%) Hispanic/Latino; 172 (2.1%) two or more races; 823 (9.9%) nonresident alien; and 858 (10.3%) race and ethnicity unknown.

Overall Enrollment in Preprofessional Programs
Of the institutions that offer accredited and candidate architecture programs, 84 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 17,834 students enrolled in preprofessional degree programs. This is an increase of 2.3% from the 2009–2010 academic year.

Of the total, 16,588 (93%) are enrolled full-time, and 1,246 (7%) part-time. There are 13,397 (75.1%) architecture students enrolled in institutions with public support and 4,437 (24.9%) in institutions with private support.

Preprofessional Enrollment by Gender
The gender breakdown of students enrolled is approximately 62/38 with 11,059 (62%) male students and 6,775 (38%) female students.

Preprofessional Enrollment by Ethnicity
There are 10,064 (56.4%) preprofessional architecture students who indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories are as follows: 80 (0.4%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 1,126 (6.3%) Asian; 31 (0.2%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 1,110 (6.2%) Black or African American; 2,946 (14%) Hispanic/Latino; 225 (1.3%) two or more races; 885 (5%) nonresident alien; and 1,817 (10.2%) race and ethnicity unknown.
ENROLLMENT

First-Time Enrollment in Preprofessional Programs
There are 4,952 newly matriculated students enrolled in preprofessional programs at institutions with accredited architecture programs for the academic year 2010–2011; 4,769 (96.3%) are enrolled full-time and 183 (3.7%) are enrolled part-time. There are 3,646 (73.6%) architecture students enrolled in institutions with public support and 1,306 (26.4%) in institutions with private support.

First-Time Enrollment in Preprofessional Programs by Gender
The gender breakdown of students enrolled is approximately 60/40 with 3,016 (60.9%) male students and 1,936 (39.1%) female.

First-Time Enrollment in Preprofessional Programs by Ethnicity
There are 2,676 (54%) architecture students who indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories are as follows: 29 (0.6%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 318 (6.4%) Asian; 5 (0.1%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 432 (8.7%) Black, Non-Hispanic; 675 (13.6%) Hispanic/Latino; 87 (1.8%) two or more races; 279 (5.6%) nonresident alien; and 451 (9.1%) race and ethnicity unknown.
Degrees Awarded by Accredited Programs (n = 6,191)
A total of 6,191 accredited degrees were awarded during the 2010–2011 academic year: 2,606 (42%) were Bachelor of Architecture degrees; 3,555 (57%) were Master of Architecture degrees; and 30 (0.48%) were Doctor of Architecture degrees.

This represents an increase of 2.8%, or 174, over the total number of degrees awarded during the 2009–2010 academic year.

The 2010–2011 distribution is statistically similar to that for the 2009–2010 academic year.
DEGREES AWARDED

Degrees Awarded by Gender
The gender breakdown for degrees awarded was comparable to that of the gender breakdown for overall enrollment: 3,543 (57%) males and 2,648 (43%) females. The distribution by gender for degrees awarded is statistically the same for the degrees of Bachelor of Architecture and Master of Architecture.

The distribution by gender for the Doctor of Architecture is the reverse: 56% female and 44% male.
Degrees Awarded by Ethnicity

Of the degrees awarded, 3,652 (59%) were awarded to White, Non-Hispanic candidates with respect to ethnicity. The remaining categories are as follows: 21 (1%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 563 (9%) Asian; 20 (0.4%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 204 (3%) Black or African American; 620 (10%) Hispanic/Latino; 49 (1.1%) two or more races; 466 (8%) nonresident alien; and 596 (10%) race and ethnicity unknown.

The distribution of degrees awarded by ethnicity was less than the overall enrollment with the exception of White, Non-Hispanic.

The distribution of degrees awarded by ethnicity is statistically the same for the degrees Bachelor of Architecture and Master of Architecture.

The distribution of degrees awarded by ethnicity for the Doctor of Architecture is 90% Asian and 10% Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.

Degrees Awarded by Race/Ethnicity
**DEGREES AWARDED**

*Degrees Awarded in Preprofessional Programs*
A total of 3,588 preprofessional degrees were awarded during the 2010–2011 academic year. This is an increase of 4.6% from the previous year.

*Degrees Awarded in Preprofessional Programs by Gender*
The gender breakdown of degrees awarded is approximately 60/40 with 2,136 (59.5%) degrees awarded to male students and 1,452 (40.5%) to female students.

*Degrees Awarded in Preprofessional Programs by Ethnicity*
There were 2,323 (64.7%) degrees awarded to students who indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining were as follows: 18 (0.5%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 212 (5.9%) Asian; 16 (0.4%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 133 (3.7%) Black or African American; 424 (11.8%) Hispanic/Latino; 41 (1.1%) two or more races; 139 (3.9%) nonresident alien; and 283 (7.9%) race and ethnicity unknown.

*Postprofessional Programs*
Of the institutions that offer accredited architecture programs, 74 offer postprofessional programs; 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 two from the 2009–2010 academic year.

*Team room, Frank Lloyd Wright School of Architecture, Taliesin West; photo courtesy Kin DuBois, FAIA*
FACULTY

Total Faculty—Appointment Type
There are 5,998 faculty teaching in NAAB-accredited degree programs. This number includes adjuncts. This represents an increase of 6.3% from the previous academic year.

Of this total, 2,412 (40.2%) are full-time, 1,042 (17.4%) are part-time, and 2,546 (42.4%) are adjunct.

The biggest change has been in the percentage of faculty with part-time appointments: from 14% of the total in 2009–2010 to 17% in 2010–2011.

Full-time faculty decreased from 42% to 40%, and adjuncts decreased from 44% to 43%.

Faculty by Appointment Type

- Full-Time: 40%
- Part-Time: 17%
- Adjunct: 43%
Faculty—Gender

The gender breakdown of faculty is 72/28 with 4,298 (72%) male faculty and 1,700 (28%) female. The gender balance within the faculty has shifted since the 2010–2011 academic year. That year, the gender balance among the faculty was 76/24.

When viewing the percentages by rank for the 2010–2011 academic year,
- For full professors, the distribution by gender is 79/21.
- For associate professors, the distribution by gender is 73/27.
- For assistant professors, the distribution is 68/32.
- For instructors, the distribution is 70/30.
Faculty—Rank
Of the total faculty, 1,019 (17%) are full professors, 1,044 (17%) are associate professors, 1,192 (20%) are assistant professors, and 2,743 (46%) are instructors.

Of the total number of instructors, 1,822 (66.4%) are adjuncts.

The distribution across faculty ranks has shifted since 2010 with an increase in the number of instructors (from 43% to 46%) and a corresponding decrease in the number of individuals at the other ranks.

In 2010, 18% were full professors, 18% were associate professors, 21% were assistant professors, and 43% were instructors.
Faculty—Ethnicity
There were 4,635 (77%) faculty members that indicated White with respect to ethnicity. The remaining indicated the following: 11 (0.2%) American Indian or Alaskan Native; 383 (6.4%) Asian; 10 (0.2%) Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander; 169 (2.8%) Black, Non-Hispanic; 446 (7.4%) Hispanic/Latino; 49 (0.8%) two or more races; 91 (1.5%) nonresident alien; and 204 (3.4%) race and ethnicity unknown.

This distribution represents a modest shift from 2009–2010. Last year, the distribution between White and the other categories was closer to 80/20.

When viewing the distribution by rank for the 2010–2011 academic year,
• For full professors, the distribution by ethnicity is 85/15.
• For associate professors, the distribution is 79/21.
• For assistant professors, the distribution is 72/28.
• For instructors, the distribution is 75/25.
**FACULTY**

**Credentials for Full, Associate, and Assistant Professors**
Based on data supplied by the architecture programs for the 2010–2011 academic year, 2,149 individuals are employed as full-time instructional faculty at the full, associate, or assistant professor level. Of that number, 1,250 (58.1%) have an accredited M. Arch. degree and 74% are registered to practice in a U.S. jurisdiction.

2. Statistics on registration reported for the 2009–2010 academic year were calculated against the total number of faculty instead of only against full-time instructional faculty at the assistant, associate, and full-professor level.
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 $74,737 to $107,392 with an average salary of $88,076. The national salary range of averages for associate professor is $59,823 to $77,109 with an average salary of $67,303. The national salary range of averages for assistant professor is $49,520 to $60,856 with an average salary of $54,772.

For professors and instructors, national averages were higher in 2011 than in 2010; for associate and assistant professors, the averages were lower.

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.

### TOTAL All ACSA Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
<th>2009 Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$74,737</td>
<td>$107,392</td>
<td>$88,076</td>
<td>$72,651</td>
<td>$104,960</td>
<td>$86,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$59,823</td>
<td>$77,709</td>
<td>$67,303</td>
<td>$59,349</td>
<td>$88,560</td>
<td>$67,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$49,520</td>
<td>$60,856</td>
<td>$54,772</td>
<td>$48,942</td>
<td>$61,483</td>
<td>$55,199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$16,900</td>
<td>$28,579</td>
<td>$23,532</td>
<td>$16,900</td>
<td>$25,946</td>
<td>$20,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL All ACSA Regions—Public

<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>$78,119</td>
<td>$117,174</td>
<td>$94,676</td>
<td>$96,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$63,831</td>
<td>$84,229</td>
<td>$72,327</td>
<td>$71,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$51,773</td>
<td>$66,339</td>
<td>$59,422</td>
<td>$62,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$22,077</td>
<td>$31,475</td>
<td>$26,168</td>
<td>$27,644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL All ACSA Regions—Private

<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>$69,733</td>
<td>$92,914</td>
<td>$78,310</td>
<td>$76,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$53,891</td>
<td>$68,059</td>
<td>$59,866</td>
<td>$53,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$43,225</td>
<td>$52,742</td>
<td>$47,889</td>
<td>$46,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$15,895</td>
<td>$24,294</td>
<td>$19,630</td>
<td>$25,552</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In public institutions, university averages exceeded program averages, except for associate professors.

In private institutions, program averages exceeded university averages, except at the instructor level.
FACULTY

Averages by ACSA Region
The highest regional average for full professor is in the East Central region at $106,611. The highest average for associate professor is also in the East Central region at $74,305. The highest average for assistant professor is in the West Central region at $59,897. The highest regional average for instructor is in the West region at $40,705.

All Faculty—Northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$85,865</td>
<td>$112,615</td>
<td>$94,954</td>
<td>$94,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$61,181</td>
<td>$74,473</td>
<td>$68,262</td>
<td>$65,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$46,230</td>
<td>$58,577</td>
<td>$52,587</td>
<td>$55,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$9,744</td>
<td>$14,681</td>
<td>$11,938</td>
<td>$19,843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Faculty—Southeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$62,656</td>
<td>$81,911</td>
<td>$73,191</td>
<td>$84,092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$55,170</td>
<td>$76,079</td>
<td>$62,875</td>
<td>$61,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$42,757</td>
<td>$57,428</td>
<td>$51,813</td>
<td>$53,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$22,384</td>
<td>$27,703</td>
<td>$24,817</td>
<td>$32,741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Faculty—Southwest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$66,466</td>
<td>$116,537</td>
<td>$83,307</td>
<td>$92,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$62,224</td>
<td>$87,048</td>
<td>$73,593</td>
<td>$65,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$54,016</td>
<td>$67,398</td>
<td>$59,355</td>
<td>$59,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$16,116</td>
<td>$30,768</td>
<td>$22,122</td>
<td>$30,481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Faculty—West

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$70,088</td>
<td>$105,773</td>
<td>$90,626</td>
<td>$92,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$63,142</td>
<td>$80,098</td>
<td>$70,945</td>
<td>$66,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$56,012</td>
<td>$67,040</td>
<td>$59,897</td>
<td>$58,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$17,368</td>
<td>$21,767</td>
<td>$19,709</td>
<td>$21,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All Faculty—West Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$77,492</td>
<td>$105,773</td>
<td>$90,626</td>
<td>$92,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$63,142</td>
<td>$80,098</td>
<td>$70,945</td>
<td>$66,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$56,012</td>
<td>$67,040</td>
<td>$59,897</td>
<td>$58,567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$17,368</td>
<td>$21,767</td>
<td>$19,709</td>
<td>$21,815</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## FACULTY SALARIES

### All Faculty—East Central

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$84,224</td>
<td>$132,558</td>
<td>$106,611</td>
<td>$78,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$64,941</td>
<td>$86,834</td>
<td>$74,305</td>
<td>$59,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$53,981</td>
<td>$64,813</td>
<td>$59,078</td>
<td>$51,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$21,401</td>
<td>$33,192</td>
<td>$25,846</td>
<td>$29,147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TOTAL All ACSA Regions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Type</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Univ. Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$74,737</td>
<td>$107,392</td>
<td>$88,076</td>
<td>$88,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>$59,823</td>
<td>$77,709</td>
<td>$67,303</td>
<td>$64,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist. Prof.</td>
<td>$49,520</td>
<td>$60,856</td>
<td>$54,772</td>
<td>$55,829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$19,584</td>
<td>$28,579</td>
<td>$23,532</td>
<td>$26,801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OTHER NAAB ACTIVITIES IN 2011

Vision, Mission, Values
On October 22, 2011, the directors of the National Architectural Accrediting Board 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 is intended to guide the work of the NAAB in all its activities.

The NAAB’s website has been revised to reflect the new statements.

Preparation for the 2013 Accreditation Review Conference (ARC13)
One of the central activities during 2011 was a study of accredited architecture education, commissioned as part of the NAAB’s preparation for the 2013 Accreditation Review Conference (ARC13).

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.

McKinley Advisors (McKinley) was retained to assist the NAAB with the study. The overall process of collecting information was split into several stages, including detailed interviews with NAAB leaders, focus group discussions, and an electronic survey designed to collect information from a diverse audience representing the profession.

Research for the project began in August 2010 with interviews of the NAAB’s directors. The second stage of research consisted of eight focus groups conducted at various meetings of the collateral organizations during late 2010 and early 2011. The composition of each group was carefully selected to represent the distinct stakeholder groups that make up the architecture field:

- Educators (two sessions)
- Firm principals and professional architects (one session)
- Firm principals from underrepresented populations (one session)
- Interns (one session)
- Professional architects in nontraditional settings (one session)
- Registration board officials (one session)
- Students (one session)

The goal of this stage was to gather qualitative feedback regarding the accreditation process from the perspective of architecture programs, the role and use of the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, the needs and expectations of architecture students, and any “gaps” that are currently perceived in architecture education.

The final stage consisted of an electronic survey designed to capture feedback on the changing field of architecture, the future of accredited architecture education, and the impact of the 2009 changes to the NAAB Conditions for Accreditation.

The survey was developed based on the findings collected during the prior stages of research; it combined quantitative questions with open-ended, essay-style queries to help provide a comprehensive look at architecture education.
OTHER NAAB ACTIVITIES IN 2011

The NAAB and McKinley worked with each of the four collateral organizations to develop representative membership lists that would be included in the survey invitation process. Overall, nearly 27,000 individuals from across the field of architecture—including students, interns, educators, practicing architects, registration board officials and architects practicing in non-traditional settings—were invited to participate in the survey. The survey remained open for more than three weeks, and nearly 4,000 individuals participated for an overall response rate of 14.3%.

The final report, to be released on or about May 1, provides an overall summary of information that was collected from the electronic survey. It also looks more closely at certain data using various demographic factors as a lens, including the respondent’s occupation and age. The most relevant and distinguishing cross-tab findings will be included in the appendices to the report. In addition to the report, the NAAB will also release the 500-plus pages of comments provided to the open-ended questions.

In the coming months, the NAAB will invite commentary and dialogue on the results of the study through a series of discussion questions using its Facebook page.

In addition to the study, the NAAB has identified other areas of analysis for the balance of 2012. 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.
## 2012 BOARD OF DIRECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACSA</th>
<th>President</th>
<th>NCARB</th>
<th>AIA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009–2012</td>
<td><strong>Keelan P. Kaiser, AIA</strong></td>
<td><strong>Douglas K. Engebretson, FAIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009–2012</td>
<td>Springfield, MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACSA</td>
<td>President-elect</td>
<td><strong>Linda Kiisk, AIA, NCARB, LEED® AP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M.Env.D, JD, DFA (Hon.), PhD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCARB</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td><strong>William Lynn McKinney, PhD</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubuque, IA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIA</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td><strong>Amy Perenchio, Assoc. AIA, LEED® AP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2012</td>
<td><strong>Patricia Belton Oliver, FAIA</strong></td>
<td>2010–2013</td>
<td>Portland, OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACSA</td>
<td>Public Member</td>
<td><strong>Stephen Parker, AIA, LEED AP</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2014</td>
<td><strong>Nathaniel Quincy Belcher, AIA</strong></td>
<td>2011–2014</td>
<td>Calverton, MD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Park, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Member</td>
<td><strong>Ken Conrad, PE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Miguel A. Rodriguez, FAIA</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009–2012</td>
<td><strong>Patricia Belton Oliver, FAIA</strong></td>
<td>2010–2013</td>
<td>Coral Gables, FL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leawood, KS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## NAAB STAFF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea S. Rutledge, CAE</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassandra Pair</td>
<td>Manager, Accreditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Rumbarger</td>
<td>Manager, Research and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ziti Sherman</td>
<td>Manager, Finance and Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorothy Preston</td>
<td>Management &amp; Program Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesha Abdul-Mateen</td>
<td>Communication &amp; Program Associate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>