NAAB

National Architectural Accrediting Board, Inc.

HIGHLIGHTS FROM 2012 VISITING TEAM REPORTS

May 2013

Portland State University Team Room 2012; photo courtesy Portland State University

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.

Contents

2012 ACCREDITATION OF PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS IN ARCHITECTURE

The National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) accredits the following professional degree programs:

Bachelor of Architecture (B. Arch.)

Master of Architecture (M. Arch.)

Doctor of Architecture (D. Arch.)

As of March 31, 2013, there are 154 NAAB-accredited, professional degree programs at 123 institutions in the U.S. and the U.A.E.

2012 Accreditation Cycle

In calendar 2012, the NAAB completed visits to 36 institutions to review 42 programs. In total, there were:

- 24 visits for continuing accreditation of 30 programs

- Three visits for initial accreditation of three programs

- Three visits for initial candidacy for three programs

- Six visits for eligibility for initial candidacy for six programs

Analysis of Spring 2012 Visiting Team Reports for Continuing Accreditation

During 2012, NAAB teams completed visits to 24 institutions and reviewed 30 degree programs for continuing accreditation.

The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Part I.1-I.4 and II.2-II.4

For the purposes of analyzing VTR results, the analysis is in two parts. One part of the analysis will focus on the SPC, and the other part will focus on the Conditions that do not include SPC.

When considering the Conditions that do not include the SPC, the analysis is confined to the institution offering the accredited degree programs (24 institutions in 2012). Of the institutions offering professional degree programs that completed visits for continuing accreditation under the 2009 Conditions:

- One did not meet of five of Conditions listed in Part I.1–I.4 or Part II.2–II.4.

- One did not meet three of Conditions I.1–I.4 or II.2–II.4.

- Two did not meet two of Conditions I.1–I.4 or II.2–II.4.

- Six did not meet one of Conditions I.1–I.4 or II.2–II.4.

- Seven of the 24 institutions visited *Met* all of Conditions I.1–I.4 or II.2–II.4.

Of the Conditions for Accreditation that do not include SPC, which are included in Part I.1–I.4 and Part II.2–II.4, the following Condition was *Not Met* by the most number of institutions:

- I.1.4 Long Range Planning (6)

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 A Architectural Education and the Academic Community
- I.1.3.B Architectural Education and Students
- I.1.3.C Architectural Education and the Regulatory Environment
- I.1.3.E Architectural Education and the Public Good
- I.2.1. Human Resources and Human Resource Development
- I.2.5 Information Resources
- I.3.2 Annual Reports
- I.3.3 Faculty Credentials
- I.4 Policy Review
- II.2.1 Regional Accreditation
- II.2.3 Curriculum Review and Development
- II.4.2 Access to NAAB Conditions and Procedures
- II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
- II.4.4 Public Access to APRs and VTRs
- II.4.5 ARE Pass Rates

The 2009 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Part II.1, Student Performance Criteria
When considering only the SPC, the analysis is confined to the 30 professional degree programs. 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 2.6. This is an increase over the spring 2011 visit cycle when the average was 1.3.

The following SPC were *Not Met* by the most number of professional degree programs, excluding those visited for initial candidacy:

- B.2 Accessibility (10)
- B.6 Comprehensive Design (13)

These two SPC were among the most *Not-Met* in 2011 as well. The staff has reviewed the VTRs for all programs where B.6. was not met in 2011 and 2012. The results of this analysis show that teams were correctly assessing the B.6 SPC on the basis of the lack of integration of one or more of the elements.

The following SPC were *Met* by all programs:

- A.2 Design Thinking Skills
- A.5 Fundamental Design Skills
- A.8 Ordering Systems
- B.3 Sustainability
- B.4 Site Design
- B.8 Environmental Systems
- B.9 Structural Systems

- C.6 Leadership

The list of SPC met by all programs is shorter than it was in 2011. Four of the SPC on this list were also met by all degree programs in the previous year. These are,

- A.2 Design Thinking Skills
- A.8 Ordering Systems
- B.9 Structural Systems
- C.6 Leadership

Analysis of SPC B.6 Comprehensive Design in the VTRs

Over the years, program administrators have asked for assistance from the NAAB in developing new or revised curricula. These requests are generally in the form of the following question:

> "How are other programs responding to [fill-in-the-blank]?"

With the knowledge that SPC B.6, Comprehensive Design, is one SPC that is most often not met, and in anticipation of the question listed above, the NAAB set out to evaluate what visiting teams highlighted for those programs when the SPC for Comprehensive Design was "met with distinction."

The following comments are extracted from *Visiting Team Reports* submitted for visits that took place in 2011 and 2012 where the visiting team identified the program as having met B.6 "with distinction."

Florida International University:

> **2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** This SPC is primarily met through comprehensive design studio and the co-requisite integrated building systems course. In particular the integrated technical documentation in drawing is outstanding.

Ohio State University:

> **2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** Met in Course 842 Advanced Architectural Design (comprehensive studio). Supported by courses throughout the curriculum. The collaborative approach is unusual and effective.

Oklahoma State University:

> **2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** The team found primary evidence of student ability in the ARCH 4216-Comprehensive Studio. This studio and the corollary seminar ARCH 4326 teaches a comprehensive process from schematic design through construction documentation. This is a longstanding model, recognized by award of the 2004 NCARB Prize, and is a hallmark of the OSU architecture program. This SPC has been met with distinction.

University of Maryland, College Park:

> **2011 Visiting Team Assessment:** This criterion has been well met. The team found strong evidence that both Track I and II students are achieving at the level of ability in Comprehensive Design in work produced for the concurrent ARCH 600 Comprehensive Design Studio and ARCH 611 Advanced Architectural Technology Seminar. The University of Maryland's focus on integrated, innovative design is clearly stated in fall 2008 and 2009 joint syllabi for ARCH600/611: "The intent of the course ARCH 600abc/611 is to recognize the unity of design and technology by concentrating on the impact of material and technique on architectural form in a studio setting." The student work fulfilled the stated intentions of the course. The fall 2010 version of these courses took the same approach and focused on the development of the University of Maryland's 2011 entry to the Solar Decathlon competition— WaterShed.

Kent State University:

2012 Team Assessment: Comprehensive Design at Kent State is extremely well met. The student projects displayed in the evidence room showed a high level of understanding of both design and building systems. The program hires a mechanical, electrical, and structural engineer to consult weekly with the students on their project during the ARCH 40102 Fourth Year Design II.

Southern California Institute of Architecture

2012 Visiting Team Assessment: There continues to be a very high level of accomplishment in the design studios, applied studios and visual studies programs. The overall design quality is exceptional, in site design, structural innovation and envelope design, the tectonic invention and material innovation has very few peers. What is clear since the 2006 visit is that the school has put in place a structure to address comprehensive design in an equally advanced level. What is particularly worth noting is the rigor in the material research that remains in the Design Development classes where the students have the freedom to adjust their designs and explore execution in different materials or different configurations when the original selection or arrangement is determined not to function as planned. Additional comments are found in *B.6 Comprehensive Design*.

[The team's assessment of "met with distinction" is] based upon evidence found in the following studios and/or courses: Comprehensive design is seen throughout SCI-Arc's design studios and is displayed at its fullest in the Design Development courses in each program. The emphasis is shown on the technical documentation, environmental systems, and structural systems as the primary objectives. The extraordinary amount and quality of the work produced by the students in the Design Development class is to be commended.

> **B. Arch**
>
> DS1031 Dynamic Architectural Systems
>
> AS3040 Design Documentation: Analysis and Development
>
> AS3041 Design Documentation: Construction Documents
>
> DS1031 Dynamic Architectural Systems
>
> **M. Arch**
>
> DS1121 Architecture's Intervention 2: Urbanism, Landscape and Infrastructure
>
> AS3122 Design Documentation: Analysis and Development
>
> AS3222 Design Documentation: Analysis and Development
>
> DS1120 Architecture's Intervention 1: Context and Territory

The comprehensive design efforts, which are evident in the design development applied studies courses, are highly resolved in the degree to which the initial design concepts, formal structure and materials research are resolved and communicated graphically. The relationship and integration of skin to structure, circulation and building systems are highly detailed and rigorous. These projects are preceded by extensive research on related projects. These projects are completed in a collaborative manner which

represents an exceptional ability to organize and coordinate workflow, exchange ideas, and solve issues together.

Looking Ahead to the 2013 Accreditation Cycle

In 2013 the NAAB is scheduled to visit 27 institutions to review 31 programs. In total there will be:

- 16 visits for continuing accreditation of 20 programs

- Two visits for initial accreditation of two programs

- Two visits for continuation of candidacy for two programs

- Five visits for initial candidacy for five programs

- Two visits for eligibility for initial candidacy for two programs

Most of these visits will take place in the spring; six are scheduled for the fall. Decisions for programs visited in the spring will be made at the regularly scheduled NAAB meeting in July. Decisions for programs visited in the fall will be made in February 2014.

Each year, approximately 125 volunteers contribute 5,000 hours to the work of the NAAB

In 2014, after all visits for calendar 2013 have been completed and decisions rendered, the NAAB will provide an update to this report.

If programs are interested in seeing other SPC evaluated in a similar manner, please contact the NAAB at forum@naab.org.

Vision, Mission, Values of the NAAB
Preamble:

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 National Architectural Accrediting Board 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.

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.

The NAAB is the only agency in the United States that accredits professional degree programs in architecture. Because most U.S. registration boards require a candidate for licensure to have earned a NAAB-accredited degree, obtaining such a degree is an essential step toward the practice of architecture.

The commitments made by the NAAB's founders have guided its work since 1940. These were further defined in 1975 with the report *Restructuring the National Architectural Accrediting Board*. It was this report that established the scope of work and methodology in use today.

The NAAB maintains a robust assessment and evaluation practice that provides the directors and staff with the opportunity to review literature in architecture, higher education, and accreditation. This in turn ensures the NAAB is able to respond appropriately to changes that affect faculty, administrators, students, and the profession.