

03

NAAB

2016 ANNUAL REPORT

**The National Architectural
Accrediting Board®**

PART III: 2016 ACCREDITATION DECISIONS AND OTHER NAAB ACTIVITIES



Contents

01	NAAB COMMITMENT TO TRANSFORMATION OF ACCREDITATION IN PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION	3
02	STRATEGIC PRIORITIES	4
03	2016 ACCREDITATION CYCLE AND DECISIONS	9
04	ANALYSIS OF 2016 VISITING TEAM REPORTS FOR CONTINUING AND INITIAL ACCREDITATION	10
05	CANDIDATE PROGRAMS	12
06	SUBSTANTIAL EQUIVALENCY	14
07	FY 2015 INDEPENDENT AUDITOR'S REPORT ON FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	15
08	2016 NAAB DIRECTORS	16
09	NAAB STAFF	17

NAAB Commitment to Transformation of Accreditation in Professional Architectural Education

On November 1, 2016, NAAB President Judith Kinnard, FAIA, released the following statement regarding the NAAB's commitment to excellence and transformation. Her statement outlined several initiatives designed to launch the next stage of the NAAB's development as a quality assurance agency.

The National Architectural Accrediting Board's vision statement asserts its role in enhancing the value, relevance, and effectiveness of the architecture profession by establishing educational quality assurance standards that are open to diverse approaches by our schools.

One of the fundamental tenets of accreditation is the importance of self-assessment and a commitment to continuous improvement. The NAAB, through its own assessment processes, seeks to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of all aspects of the accreditation process. Underlying this effort is a larger and continual goal of making accreditation less costly to institutions with accredited programs.

Through an end-to-end review of the process, with attention to key areas like team training and expanding the use of digital team rooms, we hope to identify ways to streamline the process without compromising the NAAB's core mission.

As a result of strategic planning and assessment initiatives launched in 2015 and 2016, the NAAB has identified ways to facilitate accreditation while still maintaining the rigor expected by the public, the programs, the profession, and the U.S. registration boards, while also sustaining a quality assurance system that meets international guidelines of good practice.

In addition to a new strategic planning effort, the NAAB also initiated the following projects:

- Accreditation Process Review Task Force
- Business Process Evaluation
- Digital Accreditation Advisory Task Force
- Candidacy Advisory Task Force

These ongoing initiatives will lead to procedural changes that seek to reduce uncertainty and ambiguity for programs and teams, reduce travel costs, and demonstrate the NAAB's commitment to continuous improvement. In 2017 and 2018, the NAAB will test several of these; the results from the first round of pilot visits are expected in July 2017. The pilots will be run again during the 2018 visit cycle. The success of these efforts will depend on both the NAAB's enhanced services and support, and also on the willingness of programs to experiment with the process and to provide objective feedback. We are grateful to the programs who have participated in pilot studies using shorter visits and/or smaller teams during the past two visit cycles.

In 2013 the NAAB board approved the transitions from the NAAB six-year terms to eight-year terms of accreditation in order to reduce the costs to the schools. Because of this change, there will be no visits for continuing accreditation scheduled for 2019 or 2020. In addition to managing visits related to candidacy and initial accreditation, the NAAB will use this period to plan and implement the 2019 Accreditation Review Conference that will lead to the 2020 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation. In addition, we intend to "re-tool" all NAAB systems for accreditation management, volunteer management, data collection, and training to create a 21st-century model of accreditation.

While it is not yet possible to quantitatively project the results of the studies that will be undertaken in 2017 and 2018, the NAAB remains committed to continuous improvement. The next eighteen months will be crucial not only for improving the quality and efficiency of the NAAB's services but also in determining the scope and scale of potential changes enacted following the 2019 Accreditation Review Conference.



Judith A. Kinnard, FAIA
President

Strategic Priorities

At the February 2016 meeting, the NAAB directors engaged in a strategic planning exercise that started with a review of the six strategic areas identified in 2015. Next, the directors, working in small groups, identified tangible, achievable objectives and made an initial assignment of activities to each of those objectives.

As a result of their deliberations in February 2016, the NAAB directors established three strategic areas and crafted a goal statement for each:

Quality Assurance: The NAAB will lead and steward a system of architectural accreditation in response to the needs of society and educational institutions.

International Leadership: The NAAB will advance international accreditation in architectural education in cooperation with its global partners.

Voice Of Architectural Accreditation: The NAAB will advance the importance of architectural accreditation by communicating with its collateral partners, engaging key stakeholders in dialogue, and informing the public of new developments.

Quality Assurance Initiatives

Team Composition Task Force

On February 25, the NAAB board of directors approved a new policy regarding the process for setting limits on participation by volunteers on NAAB visiting teams for continuation of accreditation and defines a role for the NAAB's Assessment and Evaluation Committee in reviewing team member performance. These changes were originally discussed by the Team Training and Qualifications Subcommittee in 2016. The following changes will be implemented for the 2017 visit cycle and will be incorporated in the next full edition of the Procedures for Accreditation:

- a. No volunteer will be assigned to more than one team in a calendar year.
- b. Once a volunteer has participated in six visits for continuing accreditation, he/she will be eligible to participate every other year.

- c. Volunteers who have completed 15 visits for continuing accreditation, either as team members or team chairs, will be considered inactive.
- d. A roster of proposed team members for the upcoming visit cycle will be reviewed by the Assessment and Evaluation Committee and approved by the Executive Committee annually.
- e. The Assessment and Evaluation Committee will review team member assessments each year at the conclusion of the visit cycle.

Digital Accreditation Task Force

In October 2015, NAAB President Scott Veazey, AIA, formed a task force on the use of digital material in accreditation visits. Its threefold charge was to:

- Scan other agencies' use of digital formats and applications in the accreditation process
- Develop objectives and guidelines or procedures for the use of digital media in NAAB visits and in fifth-year Interim Progress Reports
- Develop guidelines for use by teams and staff in preparing, presenting, and assessing student work presented in digital format.

The task force presented its final report, "Guidelines for the Use of Digital Content in Accreditation Visits," to the board in February 2017. The board approved the report, and it is being distributed to all program administrators with visits scheduled for Fall 2017 and calendar 2018. It is also available on the NAAB website.

Several of the task force's recommendations were shared in November during the Team Room Preparation Workshop at the ACSA Administrators Conference and during team training.

The Assessment and Evaluation Committee will conduct interviews with program administrators and team chairs regarding the use of digital content (or not) during spring 2017 visits in order to continue to refine both the guidelines and the training offered by the NAAB.

Team Training Think Tank

In September 2016, NAAB President-elect Judith Kinnard and the Assessment and Evaluation Committee identified the need for a small group of program administrators who hosted 2016 visits and an equal number of team chairs (both veterans and first-timers) to be convened to review some of the issues that emerged from the board's July review of Visiting Team Reports. The VTRs reviewed were the first accreditation actions conducted under the 2014 Conditions for Accreditation.

The six members of the Think Tank were asked to help develop training guidelines that promote clarity, consensus, and predictability in the accreditation process. Underlying this effort is a larger and continual goal of making accreditation more efficient and less costly to accredited institutions.

The Task Force met by conference call before team training workshops in November and then participated in the training. The group addressed the following questions:

- Should teams be given precise guidelines on assessing social equity?
- What is the minimum quantity of student work to be included in the team room?
- Should team chairs have the authority to require printed work (instead of work presented digitally)?
- What is the appropriate way to identify issues that do not rise to being unmet conditions?
- What is the appropriate definition of minimum pass?
- Are there ways the NAAB staff can assist teams and schools in streamlining the accreditation process?

The members of the task force were:

- Daniel Friedman, FAIA (program administrator and veteran team chair)
- Denis Henmi, FAIA (first-time team chair)
- Christopher Jarrett (program administrator)
- Robert Miller, AIA (program administrator)

- Susan Shaefer Kliman, PhD, AIA (program administrator and veteran team chair)

The format produced helpful guidance to team members, the staff, and the board. It is likely the exercise will be repeated at the conclusion of the spring 2017 visit cycle with different individuals and new questions.

Pilot Studies

In 2015 and again in 2016, the NAAB tested a new approach to visit schedules with a view toward reducing the amount of time spent on-site during a visit. In 2015, the NAAB also tested smaller teams.

The result of the test of smaller teams demonstrated that smaller teams expose vulnerabilities among first-time team members, which may not be in the best interests of the process.

The result of a compressed visit schedule revealed that the amount of work by teams and team chairs is not reduced but is simply redistributed. This was especially apparent in the 2016 tests because all visits included the expectation that teams would complete a certain amount of documentary review in advance. Some programs went so far as to provide student work, in digital format, in advance as well as the reports and other documents required by the Procedures.

In general terms, the 2016 pilots largely confirmed what many already knew: participation in a NAAB visit requires a significant investment of time and the NAAB's Saturday-Wednesday commitment is longer than site visits of all other disciplines recently surveyed by the Accreditation Process Review Task Force and the Assessment and Evaluation Committee.

The NAAB Assessment and Evaluation Committee estimated that the time commitment for a chair is 60 hours and for a team member is 45 (not including required training).

The NAAB is interested in pursuing other options for visit schedules that make the most effective and efficient use of team members' time. The goal is to reduce the time commitment without harming the integrity of the process. As a result, the Assessment and Evaluation Committee provided the following guidelines to all team members preparing for 2017 visits:

- All teams should continue to be required to conduct a certain amount of work in advance. This can and should include drafting certain sections of the VTR before arriving on-site.
- Entrance and exit meetings can be compressed; these do not need to last more than 30 minutes.
- Every schedule should include at least:
 - 11 hours for team review of student work in 1-2 hour blocks; preferably longer
 - 7 hours (or less) for entrance and exit meetings and meetings with the faculty, staff, students, student leaders, and information resources staff
 - 4 hours for review of documents or records primarily before the visit
 - 4 hours for drafting the VTR on-site, assuming some sections were completed after the second previsit conference call
 - 2 hours for previsit conference calls
 - 2 hours for tours of the team room and physical resources

Finally, the NAAB has suggested to 2017 teams that exit meetings do not need to include the entire team, but should include the chair and an educator (if the chair is a practitioner).

Visit schedules and the format for exit interviews will be reviewed by the Assessment and Evaluation Committee at the conclusion of the 2017 spring cycle.

International Leadership

Task Force on International Accreditation

The 2014 Conditions for Accreditation made it possible for institutions outside of the United States to pursue candidacy for NAAB accreditation. In addition, the NAAB directors have recently included leadership in advancing international accreditation as one of the organization's strategic priorities. It is clear that certain questions need to be addressed in order to provide guidance to schools and teams.

In December 2016, NAAB President Judith Kinnard convened and charged a task force on international accreditation. The membership includes:

- Ron Blitch, FAIA, chair
- Ryan Gann, Assoc. AIA
- David Hinson, FAIA
- Peter MacKeith, dean, Fay Jones School of Architecture, University of Arkansas
- Kate Schwennsen, FAIA, director, School of Architecture, Clemson University
- Barbara Sestak, FAIA, professor, Portland State University

This task force was asked to review the *2014 Conditions* and *2015 Procedures* relative to issues of particular concern to the evaluation of programs located outside the U.S. in institutions that are not accredited by U.S. regional accreditors. The task force was asked to develop clear guidelines for teams assessing programs in diverse cultural and legal contexts.

Further, changes and additions to the *2015 Procedures for Accreditation* should be developed for schools seeking to transition from substantial equivalency to full accreditation and from candidacy for full accreditation to the substantial equivalency process. The task force is also asked to consider the long-term goals for international accreditation for the NAAB.

A final report is due at the July 2017 NAAB board meeting.

Voice for Architectural Accreditation

NAAB Website and Communications

In 2016 the NAAB rebuilt its website. The overall intent was to create a site that was people-centered rather than word-centered and to refine and reorganize content by role (e.g., parent, student, or program administrator) rather than by process (e.g., accreditation or EESA). Finally, all materials were to be available in two clicks.

The site launched in early September 2016.

2019 Accreditation Review Conference (ARC19)

The NAAB is committed to continuous improvement through regular assessment and evaluation of its processes. Although evaluation and adjustment

of procedures occurs frequently, revisions to the Conditions are only made at five-year intervals. The next comprehensive review of the Conditions for Accreditation will take place at the 2019 Accreditation Review Conference (ARC19).

In preparing for this event, NAAB has accepted the challenge to “question everything.” We are therefore proposing to consider major changes to both the Conditions and Procedures during ARC19. The overarching goal is to identify the changes that have the potential to transform the existing NAAB process into a system for accreditation in architectural education that retains what was successful, reforms what was inefficient, and sets a pattern for consistency and fairness in processes that would also reduce effort and expense by programs—all without sacrificing rigor.

Three major initiatives began the process:

1. Team Composition & Qualifications Task Force (see above)
2. Digital Accreditation Advisory Task Force (see above)
3. Accreditation Process Review Task Force

The Accreditation Process Review Task Force (APRTF) began its work in 2016 and included representatives from each collateral. It was charged with developing a comprehensive proposal rooted in best practices and guided by objectives for improving, expanding, or eliminating services and procedural sequences in accreditation of professional degrees in architecture. As part of this effort, the APRTF commissioned reports that assessed other accrediting bodies.

NAAB Positions

Following its review of the reports and recommendations from all three groups, the board took the following positions on changes that fit into four categories:

- **Process:** The NAAB is committed to being critically reflective of its process.

Scope of ARC19: To make the process more efficient, effective, and less costly to programs, the NAAB proposes to focus ARC19 on the Procedures and Conditions rather than on the SPC. Schools

have just recently adjusted their curricula to the 2014 Conditions, and in another five years more data will be available to assess their efficacy.

Conditions I.1–I.2: The NAAB seeks to write Conditions and Procedures that complement the requirements of regional accreditors in the critical areas of planning and assessment. Social equity, learning culture, defining perspectives, and resources committed to accredited professional education in architecture remain central to the NAAB Conditions and Procedures.

- **Visits:** The NAAB believes that visits are essential to the process but need to be reconceived.

Change the Visit Schedule: The NAAB believes that visit schedules should be critically examined to align more closely with other peer accreditation processes and to reduce costs.

Revise/Refine the Exit Interview Sequence: The NAAB believes that exit interviews should be critically examined with a view toward increasing their opportunities and value while reducing their redundancy.

- **Teams:** The NAAB believes that today’s team composition should be changed.

Asynchronous Teams: The NAAB will explore ways in which teams can work asynchronously with a view toward reducing the number of on-site visitors and off-site reviewers. The specific number and composition of teams visiting programs on site will remain under review.

NOTE: Programs requesting continuing accreditation in the 2018 cycle will be invited to participate in a pilot test of this in conjunction with the use of the “Guidelines for the Use of Digital Content in Accreditation Visits.”

Change the Composition of the Team Pool: The NAAB will establish new processes and criteria for team members, including direct recruiting of team members by the NAAB.

Reconsider the Role of Non-Voting Team Members: The NAAB seeks to increase the objectivity of teams and will initiate further discussion with collateral affiliates about the role and purpose of non-voting team members.

Students on NAAB Visiting Teams: The NAAB

supports the continued inclusion of a student member on visiting teams.

Term Limits on Visiting Team Members: In order to support the collaterals' interest in infusing teams with new professional and academic perspectives, the board has established limits for our valued volunteers.

- **Evidence:** The NAAB endorses the transition of digital team rooms.

Digital Team Room: Over the last three years, many programs have requested and been approved to use digital evidence in their team room. The NAAB believes that this is a positive (and inevitable) transition and has sought to inform current teams and programs of this position.

Digital Student Portfolio: The NAAB endorses the strategy of reviewing student work off-site before the visit through digital means and endorses the further study of portfolio-based reviews.

Increase Rigor and Objectivity in the Selection of Student Work: The NAAB endorses the goal of increasing objectivity and rigor in the process. The NAAB, in collaboration with ACSA, seeks to explore means and methods for achieving the goal.

In some areas, testing and implementation are already underway.

Next Steps

At the conclusion of the February meeting, NAAB President Judith Kinnard, FAIA, announced the membership of the task force responsible for leading and facilitating ARC19. Chaired by Helene Combs Dreiling, FAIA, the task force will include:

- John Cays, AIA
- Rocco Ceo, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP
- Ryan Cusak
- David Hinson, FAIA
- Kevin Flynn, FAIA
- Dale McKinney, FAIA
- Barbara Sestak, FAIA

Working from these NAAB position statements, ARC19 will be designed to focus attention on those Conditions for Accreditation related to:

- Mission, Identity, and Self-Assessment
- Resources
- Professional Degrees and Curriculum
- Preparatory Education
- Public Information

Further, ARC19 will review and refine those Conditions that duplicate the efforts of institutions and regional accrediting agencies, while still holding programs accountable for learning culture, social equity, defining perspectives, and program resources. Finally, ARC19 will ask participants to consider new approaches to processes and procedures that reduce the efforts expended by programs, teams, and the board in preparing for and conducting a visit.

At this time, a final determination has not been made as to the scope of the review of Student Performance Criteria (SPC) at ARC19. The NAAB will continue to evaluate the 2014 SPC, and the ARC19 Task Force will make a final recommendation later this year.

Over the visit cycles that remain between the release of this report and ARC19, the NAAB will test many new processes, review the history of SPC and, in collaboration with ACSA and others, assess the effectiveness of other changes under consideration.

2016 Accreditation Cycle and Decisions

In calendar year 2016, the NAAB visited 35 institutions and reviewed 40 professional degree programs in architecture.

-
- 24 visits to review 32 programs for continuing accreditation; eight of these visits are for concurrent review of two accredited programs.
 - 3 visits for initial accreditation
 - 4 visits for continuation of candidacy
 - 2 visits scheduled for initial candidacy
 - 2 visits for eligibility

Continuation of Candidacy

Alfred State College, SUNY
American University in Dubai
California Baptist University
Kendall College of Art & Design/Ferris State University

Initial Candidacy

Philadelphia University (M. Arch.)
Universidad del Turabo

Eligibility for Candidacy

Carnegie Mellon University (M. Arch.)
New York City College of Technology (B. Arch.)

Results of 2016 Accreditation Decisions

Eight-year Term of Continuing Accreditation

Cooper Union
Cornell University (B. Arch.)
Drury University
Massachusetts College of Art and Design
Mississippi State University
NewSchool of Architecture and Design
Parsons, The New School for Design
Pratt Institute
Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute
Rice University
Syracuse University
Texas Tech University
University of Arizona
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of Idaho
University of Kansas
University of Massachusetts, Amherst
University of North Carolina, Charlotte
University of Notre Dame
University of Pennsylvania
University of Texas, Arlington
University of Texas, San Antonio
University of Utah

Initial Accreditation

Marywood University (B. Arch.)
Pennsylvania State University (M. Arch.)
South Dakota State University (M. Arch.)

Analysis of 2016 Visiting Team Reports for Continuing and Initial Accreditation

The first visits conducted using the *2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation* were held in 2016. NAAB teams completed visits for continuing accreditation to 24 institutions and reviewed 32 degree programs and three visits for initial accreditation.

Visits for initial candidacy and continuation of candidacy are not included in this analysis. Because many of these programs are in the early stages of development, teams have the option to designate Conditions or Student Performance Criteria (SPC) as “in progress,” “not-yet-met,” or “not applicable.” Therefore, in order to ensure a comparable evaluation, emerging programs are not included.

2014 NAAB Conditions for Accreditation, Part I, Sections 1–6, and Part II, Sections 2–4

For the purposes of analyzing VTR results for Part I, Sections 1–6, and Part II, Sections 2–4, the analysis is confined to the institution offering the accredited degree program(s). Further, a number of these items are no longer evaluated by teams but instead are reviewed and summarized in the VTR.

Of the institutions offering professional degree programs that completed visits for continuing or initial accreditation in 2016:

- Three institutions did not address or did not meet two items from Conditions I.1–I.4 or II.2–II.4.
- Six institutions did not address or did not meet one item from Conditions I.1–I.4 or II.2–II.4.

There was no pattern among the deficiencies noted by the visiting teams.

The following items from these sections were addressed or **Met** by all programs

- I.1.1 History and Mission
- I.1.2 Learning Culture

- I.1.4 Defining Perspectives (All)
- I.1.6.A Program Self-Assessment
- I.2.2 Physical Resources
- I.2.4 Information Resources
- I.2.5. Administrative Structure and Governance
- II.2.1 Institutional Accreditation
- II.4.3 Access to Career Development Information
- II.4.7 Student Financial Information

2014 Condition II.1—Student Performance Criteria (SPC)

For the purposes of analyzing VTR results for Condition II.1, all professional degree programs visited in 2016 for continuing and initial accreditation 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 following SPC were **Not Met** by the greatest number of professional degree programs reviewed for continuing or initial accreditation:

- B.3 Codes and Standards (8)
- B.2 Site Design (7)
- B.9 Building Services Systems (7)
- C.3 Integrative Design (7)
- B.10 Financial Considerations (6)

The following SPC were **Met** by all programs:

- A.1 Professional Communication Skills
- A.2 Design Thinking Skills
- A.3 Investigative Skills
- A.4 Architectural Design Skills

- A.6 Use of Precedents
- C.1 Research

Finally, these SPC were cited as **Met with Distinction** most frequently by visiting teams:

- A.1 Professional Communication Skills
- B.5 Structural Systems
- B.7 Building Envelope Systems and Assemblies
- C.1 Research
- D.1 Stakeholder Roles in Architecture

Candidate Programs

As of February 28, 2017, the NAAB is managing 21 programs seeking or in candidacy; the status of these programs is described below.

Programs Seeking Eligibility

INSTITUTION	DEGREE PROGRAM	MOST RECENT ACTIVITY	NEXT STEP
Effat University (Saudi Arabia)	B. Arch.	Application received 3/2016	Eligibility denied (2016)
Holy Spirit University, Kaslik (Lebanon)	M. Arch.	Application received 7/4/16	Eligibility decision tabled (October 2016)
Kean University (NJ)	M. Arch.	Application received 8/15/16	Eligibility visit pending
Indiana University (Bloomington)	M. Arch.	Trustees approved June 2016	Application expected (2017)
Ball State University (IN)	B. Arch.	Pending institutional approval	Application expected (2017)

Programs with Eligibility Preparing for Initial Candidacy

INSTITUTION	DEGREE PROGRAM	MOST RECENT ACTIVITY	NEXT STEP
New York Institute of Technology	M. Arch.	Eligibility (2016)	Initial candidacy visit (2017)
Carnegie Mellon University	M. Arch.	Eligibility (2016)	Initial candidacy visit (2017)
Fairmont State University (WV)	M. Arch.	Eligibility (2013) Candidacy denied (2015)	Initial candidacy visit (2018)
New York City College of Technology, CUNY	B. Arch.	Eligibility (2017)	Initial candidacy visit (2018)

**Programs in Candidacy, Preparing for
Continuation of Candidacy or Initial Accreditation**

INSTITUTION	DEGREE PROGRAM	MOST RECENT ACTIVITY	NEXT STEP
Dunwoody College of Technology (MN)	B. Arch.	Eligibility (2013) Initial Candidacy (2015)	Continuation of Candidacy (2017)
Alfred State (SUNY)	B. Arch.	Eligibility (2013) Initial Candidacy (2014) Continuation of Candidacy (2016)	Continuation of Candidacy or Initial Accreditation (2018)
American University of Dubai	B. Arch.	Eligibility (2013) Initial Candidacy (2014) Continuation of Candidacy (2016)	Continuation of Candidacy or Initial Accreditation (2018)
California Baptist University	M. Arch.	Eligibility (2013) Initial Candidacy (2014) Continuation of Candidacy (2016)	Continuation of Candidacy or Initial Accreditation (2018)
Kendall College of Art/Ferris State University (MI)	M. Arch.	Eligibility (2013) Initial Candidacy (2014) Continuation of Candidacy (2016)	Continuation of Candidacy or Initial Accreditation (2018)
Philadelphia University	M. Arch.	Eligibility (2015) Initial Candidacy (2016)	Continuation of Candidacy or Initial Accreditation (2018)
Bowling Green State University (OH)	M. Arch.	Eligibility (2012) Initial Candidacy (2013) Continuation of Candidacy (2015)	Initial Accreditation (2017)
Universidad del Turabo	B. Arch.	Eligibility (2015) Initial Candidacy (2016)	Continuation of Candidacy (2018)
University of Maine, Augusta	B. Arch.	Eligibility (2012) Initial Candidacy (2013) Continuation of Candidacy (2015)	Continuation of Candidacy or Initial Accreditation (2017)
Lebanese American University	B. Arch.	Eligibility (2012) Initial Candidacy (2013) Continuation of Candidacy (2015)	Continuation of Candidacy or Initial Accreditation (2017)
University of the District of Columbia	M. Arch.	Eligibility (2011) Initial Candidacy (2013) Continuation of Candidacy (2015)	Initial Accreditation (2017)
Rochester Institute of Technology (NY)	M. Arch.	Eligibility (Oct. 2010) Initial Candidacy (2011) Continuation of Candidacy (2013) Continuation of Candidacy (2015)	Initial Accreditation (2017)

Substantial Equivalency

Substantial equivalency (SE) identifies a degree program in architecture as comparable in educational outcomes in all significant aspects and indicates that it provides an educational experience meeting acceptable standards, even though such program may differ in format or method of delivery. Substantial equivalency is not accreditation.

The most significant differences between accreditation and substantial equivalency are that accredited programs are preparing graduates to practice in the U.S. Programs with the SE designation are focused on preparing graduates to practice in their home country.

The NAAB continues to receive requests to evaluate programs outside the U.S. to determine if they are substantially equivalent.

The status of the programs pursuing the designation is listed below.

In addition to these programs, the NAAB has been advised that the Bartlett School, University College London, and Queen's University in Belfast are interested in seeking the designation.

Programs with the SE Designation

INSTITUTION (COUNTRY)	MOST RECENT ACTIVITY	NEXT STEPS/ VISITS
Istanbul Technical University	SE renewed in 2015	Visit to renew SE or int'l accreditation (2021)
Kuwait University	SE renewed in 2016	Visit to renew SE or int'l accreditation (2022)
King Saud University (Saudi Arabia)	Received SE in 2013	Visit to renew SE or int'l accreditation (2019)
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid	Received SE in 2015	Visit to renew SE or int'l accreditation (2021)
Universidad Europea de Madrid	Received SE in 2015	Visit to renew SE or int'l accreditation (2021)
University of Bahrain	Received SE in 2015	Visit to renew SE or int'l accreditation (2021)
Universidad San Pablo CEU (Madrid)	Received SE in 2015	Visit to renew SE or int'l accreditation (2021)
Eastern Mediterranean University (North Cyprus)	Received SE in 2016	Visit to renew SE or int'l accreditation (2022)
Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile	Received SE in 2016	Visit to renew SE or int'l accreditation (2022)
University of Dammam (Saudi Arabia)	Received SE in 2016	Visit to renew SE or int'l accreditation (2022)

FY 2015 Independent Auditor's Report on Financial Statements

The most recent independent auditor's report on the NAAB's financial statements is for the fiscal year ending December 31, 2015. The Statement of Activities from the FY 2015 report is below. The NAAB makes its annual IRS Form 990 tax filing available for review at www.naab.org.

NATIONAL ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD, INC.		
Statements of Activities		
Years Ended December 31, 2015 and 2014 (restated)		
	2015	2014 (Restated – Note 11)
Unrestricted Revenue and Support		
Contributions	\$ 1,376,112	\$ 1,362,646
EESA evaluation income	467,865	335,345
Other program income	64,552	80,366
Investment (loss) income	(36,573)	21,624
Total unrestricted revenue and support	<u>1,871,956</u>	<u>1,799,981</u>
Expenses		
Program services:		
Accreditation	370,388	363,477
EESA	208,269	192,102
International relations	163,425	149,020
Communications	<u>32,595</u>	<u>27,784</u>
Total program services	<u>774,677</u>	<u>732,383</u>
Supporting services:		
Management and general	320,425	353,713
Board activities	<u>655,147</u>	<u>539,802</u>
Total supporting services	<u>975,572</u>	<u>893,515</u>
Total expenses	<u>1,750,249</u>	<u>1,625,898</u>
Changes in Net Assets	121,707	174,083
Net Assets , beginning of year	<u>1,774,692</u>	<u>1,600,609</u>
Net Assets , end of year	<u>\$ 1,896,399</u>	<u>\$ 1,774,692</u>



2016 NAAB Directors

<i>President</i> Scott C. Veazey, AIA Louisville, KY	NCARB 2013–2016
<i>President-elect</i> Judith A. Kinnard, FAIA New Orleans	ACSA 2014–2017
<i>Treasurer</i> Celeste Allen Novak, FAIA, LEED AP BD+C Ann Arbor, MI	AIA 2014–2017
<i>Secretary</i> Ronald Blitch, FAIA, FACHA, NCARB New Orleans	NCARB 2014–2017
Helene Combs Dreiling, FAIA Roanoke, VA	AIA 2015–2018
Jori Erdman, AIA, NOMA, LEED AP Baton Rouge, LA	ACSA 2015–2018
Ryan Gann, Assoc. AIA Chicago	AIAS 2014–2016
David Golden, Assoc. AIA Philadelphia	AIAS 2015–2017
Brian P. Kelly, AIA College Park, MD	ACSA 2013–2016
W. Lynn McKinney Providence, RI	Public Member 2014–2017
Tamara Redburn, AIA, NCARB, LEED AP Memphis	AIA 2013–2016
Daniel Taylor Boston	Public Member 2015–2018
Thomas R. Wood, AIA Aurora, CO	NCARB 2015–2018

NAAB Staff

Andrea S. Rutledge, CAE, Hon. AIA

Executive Director

Cassandra Pair

Director, Accreditation

Janet Rumbarger

Director, Research & Assessment

Ziti Sherman

Director, Finance & Administration

Kesha Abdul-Mateen

Administrator, Education and Evaluation Services for Architects

Anne Dow

Administrative Assistant



2016 ANNUAL REPORT

National Architectural Accrediting Board®

©2016 All rights reserved

1101 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 410
Washington, DC 20036

WWW.NAAB.ORG