CONFIDENTIAL

Canberra Accord on Architectural Education

Type of Report: **Periodic Review**

Name of Accreditation/Validation/Recognition System Reviewed:

 KOREAN ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD (KAAB)
_____

Dates of Review Visit(s):
24th to 28th APRIL 2010

Date of Review Report:
28th APRIL 2010

Status/Edition: (draft/final/confirmed)
REVIEW TEAM DRAFT   revised 29th April 2010

CANBERRA ACCORD KOREA PERIODIC REVIEW APRIL 24 – 28 2010

B. 1. Introduction

a) Summary
[This section should include some context for the review: who made the request, when, and under what circumstances. Also please identify all visits upon which the report is based (university, organization, etc.)

It was decided at the April 2009 meeting of the Canberra Accord signatories that the periodic validation visit to Korea would take place in April 2010. The Review Team members were nominated by Canberra Accord signatories and confirmed by the KAAB in February 2010.

PROGRAM OF THE VISIT
The Canberra Accord Review Team members were met at Seoul Incheon Airport and escorted to their hotel on Friday 23rd April 2010. They met with Dr Sungjung Chough and KAAB Facilitator Associate Professor Junsuk Lee at 8.30am on Saturday 24th at their hotel for a preliminary briefing. Amongst other matters the Review Team discussed the draft timetable and requested some adjustments, including two rather than one visits to Kookmin University, the program undergoing accreditation. The Review Team were given hard copies of the KAAB Conditions and Procedures and KAAB brochure.

The Review Team was then shown around parts of Seoul before joining KAAB members for a welcome dinner.

The Review Team met in camera at 9.00am on Sunday 25th April to review the Canberra Accord Rules and Procedures, KAAB Conditions and Procedures, KAAB Self Assessment, and related documents. The Team also compiled a list of additional material required and questions for the KAAB.

The KAAB hosted an Entrance Meeting at 11.00am. Dr Chough gave a comprehensive presentation covering the development of the accreditation system, its detail, structure and implementation, as well as a flow chart of the full process and appeal mechanisms. A copy of the powerpoint presentation is attached in Attachment H.

The Review Team requested further material, this was all provided by KAAB staff; refer to B3 c) and B5 below.

After lunch with the KAAB, the Review Team went to Kookmin University to observe the Accreditation Site Visit in progress. The Review Team met the KAAB Visiting Team and Kookmin faculty, toured facilities and inspected the comprehensive exhibition of student work. The Review Team then met to review the documentation provided and discuss observations made during the site visit.

On Monday 26th the Review Team met in camera before returning to Kookmin University where it revisited the exhibition, was introduced to the President and observed the meeting with students. The team returned to the KAAB office where staff had laid out copies of APRs and all Annual Reports for every accredited program. The Annual Reports were in Korean, but Associate Professor Lee explained the format and content of particular reports requested by the Review Team (Seoul National University and Hanyang University, Ansan campus).

The Review Team then went to Seoul National University where senior faculty presented an outline of the Architecture Program and reported on preparation for the scheduled Accreditation Site Visit in late 2011. The briefing was followed by a guided tour of a

specially mounted exhibition of studio work from all years and an inspection of school facilities.

KAAB PROCESS
Korea is undergoing a period of rapid change in architectural education, stimulated by the incoming new Architects' Act and promoted by the KAAB. The new Act and associated changes to Registration requirements is increasing the pressure on programs to become accredited.

The accreditation system that has been developed by the KAAB over the last decade is rigorous and comprehensive. Checks and balances are not only allowed for in the structure but are being applied in practice.

KAAB EXIT MEETING
The Exit Meeting was held at the KAAB office at 9.30 on Wednesday 28th. The Review Team explained their understanding of the Canberra Accord reporting protocols as set out in 2.1e), **"Periodic Review Report,"** *on page 11 of the Canberra Accord Rules and Procedures. The Team discussed the visit and its findings, and commented on the published KAAB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation and their implementation. The Team did not disclose its recommendation to the Canberra Accord signatory systems under B.2a) below.*

FACILITATION OF THE CANBERRA ACCORD VISIT
The Review Team thanks the KAAB and its staff for the thorough preparation and excellent organization of the visit. Dr Chough brought a wealth of knowledge and warm hospitality whilst Associate Professor Lee was tireless in assisting the Review Team and helping them understand all the documents and procedures.

The Review Team commends the Korean Architects Accreditation Board (KAAB) for the range and depth of the material provided and the quality of the English translations.

b) Reviewers
[Enter name(s) and contact details]

Marc Boutin   Educator member
marc@the-mbac.ca
+1 403 862 9081
+1 403 261 9050
The Marc Boutin Architectural Collaborative
1005a First Street SW
Calgary ALBERTA T2R0T2
Canada

Paul Berkemeier   Practitioner member
pba@bigpond.net.au
paul@paulberkemeier.com.au
+61 418 461 065
+61 2 9909 1277
Paul Berkemeier Architect
67 Milson Road
Cremorne NSW 2090
Australia

B. 2. Compliance

a)   Recommendation to Canberra Accord signatory systems:

This version was sent to KAAB for their review for factual accuracy. The recommendation has been deleted.

[Recommendations open to reviewers:
1. that the accreditation/validation/recognition system in question be accepted by the other signatory systems, for a period of **six years**, as leading to outcomes substantially equivalent to those from the other signatory systems; or
2. that the accreditation/validation/recognition system in question be accepted by the other signatory systems, for a period of not more than **three years**, subject to the responsible signatory system providing, within six months, a report which satisfies the other signatory systems that adequate steps are being taken to address the specific deficiencies or concerns identified by the review team; or
3. that the accreditation/validation/recognition system in question has such serious deficiencies with respect to the characteristics, principles, and/or criteria required of a signatory system, that the signatory system **reverts immediately to provisional status.**

b) Operational and educational output standards
[Say whether the overall operational and educational output standards were or were not found to be substantially equivalent to those of other signatory systems in the Canberra Accord.]
The Review Team found that the overall operational and educational output standards were substantially equivalent to those of other signatory systems in the Canberra Accord.

c) Compliance with criteria for substantial equivalence
   [List here any criteria not substantially equivalent with comments below in section
   B. 3 on confirmation, or not, after each individual criterion.]
The Review Team found that the KAAB system complied with all relevant criteria for substantial equivalence as detailed in section B3.

The Review Team was unable to determine compliance with two of the criteria:
        B4 II e) on page 6 for which the Review Team was not able to discern the intent of the criterion, and
        B4 IV l) on page 10 for which The Review Team assessed that the responsibility to comprehensively evaluate the sum total of a student's educational course work in order to meet the accredited architecture program's Student Performance Criteria (SPC) lies with the individual architecture program.
These criteria have been marked N/A.

B. 3. Characteristics, Principles and Criteria for Assessing Substantial Equivalency
[Comment under each item in sections I-V on whether adequate compliance has been met/not met]

I. General Characteristics
NOTE: All cited references in this section are found in Appendix A – KAAB Conditions and Procedures

Organizations running accreditation/validation/recognition systems covered by the Accord are expected to have the following general characteristics:

a) be named organizations (authorities, agencies, or institutions) that are representative of the architecture profession and which have statutory powers or recognized professional authority for accrediting/validating/recognizing program/mes designed to satisfy the academic requirements for admission to the profession in the locality where accreditation/validation/recognition takes place, subject to additional requirements imposed by local regulations and practice requirements;

Met. The KAAB has the authority, through the Federation of Institutes of Korean Architects (FIKA), a consortium of architectural regulators and architectural academic institutions, for accrediting architecture programs in order to satisfy the academic requirements for admission into the architectural profession.

b) be independent of the academic institutions, professional organizations, and government agencies delivering accredited/validated/recognized program/mes within their jurisdiction;

Met. The KAAB is an independent agent with the necessary autonomy from the profession and the academia, in order to objectively accredit professional architectural programs.

c) have an active, robust accreditation/validation/recognition system in place, with established processes, procedures, and practices that are well-documented;

Met. The KAAB, since January 2005, has initiated a well-documented and transparent accreditation system, defined by the KAAB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation (C+P) that are developed from a systematic review and analysis of established international accreditation practices.

d) have a record of accomplishment in accreditation/validation/recognition with sufficient experience and magnitude of operation (normally a minimum of five programs over at least seven years).

Met. The KAAB, since 2005, have accredited 21 architecture programs, with a schedule to accredit a further 9 by the end of 2010.

II. Common Agreed Principles
Systems for the accreditation/validation/recognition of architecture program/mes are expected to be underpinned by common agreed principles such as:

a) the system must operate at all times in accordance with a high standard of professionalism, ethics, and objectivity;

Met. The KAAB has a well-established office with the requisite human and physical resources, and an equivalent conditions and procedures framework to operate an ambitious and accountable accreditation process.

b) the process must be transparent and consistent;

Met. The Conditions and Procedures (C+P) developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, is consistent with other signatory members, and features a well-

documented system with checks and balances that promote consistent and uniform process and review. This process includes an appeal mechanism that facilitates accountability, complete with independent arbitration (6.0 Visit Follow-up, 6.5, Appeals and Arbitration). It should be noted that there exists some inconsistencies in the appeal process that are further discussed in the B.4 g) Conclusion section on page 16 of this report.

c) the activities must be conducted in relation to individual program/mes in confidence and with firmly established procedures and conditions for objective and consistent evaluation;
Met. The Conditions and Procedures (C+P) developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, is parallel with other signatory members, and features an appropriate degree of confidentiality in a well-documented system with checks and balances that promote consistent and uniform process and review.

d) those involved in the accreditation/validation/recognition process must be knowledgeable and competent in matters related to architectural accreditation/validation/recognition, education, and practice;
Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members, and features a fair system for the selection, training, and development of experience in accreditation visit team members. The processes and protocol for the visits are defined by the Handbook for Visiting Team Chairs and Members 2005 Edition, contained within the C+P.

e) accreditation/validation/recognition is of individual program/mes/academic awards/qualifications and not of institutions;
N/A, the Review Team was not able to discern the intent of this criterion.

f) evaluations of specified academic program/mes are conducted by peer reviewers and must include review of the program/me's self-evaluation documents, a site visit, and inspection of student work;
Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members, and includes the review of the Architecture Program Report (APR), a site visit that reviews a program's resources, facilities, curriculum, and policies such that it can support the students' educational development towards professional proficiency, and the Student Performance Criteria (SPC) to ascertain the quality of educational deliverables (refer to 1. Overview of the Accreditation Process).

g) the standard of students' work should be the main criterion in determining accreditation/validation/recognition;
Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members, and features a methodological review of the full spectrum of student work as evidenced in an exhibition created by the program, which features high and low pass student work. These educational deliverables (SPC) are the main criterion in determining the efficacy of an architecture program (refer to 2.2 Student Performance Criteria).

h) levels of physical, financial, human, and information resources should be appropriate to the context of the institution.
Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members, and includes the review of available resources for the functioning of the program and its ability to reach its goals (refer to 4.1.7 Human Resources, 4.1.8 Physical Resources, 4.1.9 Information Resources, and 4.1.10 Financial Resources).

III. Criteria for Accreditation/Validation/Recognition

The criteria for accreditation/validation/recognition should address the following:

a) a suitable environment to deliver the program/me;

Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members, and includes a process by which the program's environment is evaluated, within both the review of the APR and the subsequent site visit (refer to 4.1.8 Physical Resources).

b) adequate leadership for the program/me;

Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members, and includes an appraisal of the program's leadership and decision-making process, in both the review of the APR and the subsequent site visit (refer to 4.1.7 Human Resources).

c) suitably qualified people teaching in the program/me;

Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members, and includes a review of the qualifications and expertise of the teaching human resources of a program, as presented in the APR and through the subsequent site visit (refer to 4.1.7 Human Resources).

d) a curriculum providing a broad preparation for architectural practice;

Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members, and includes the review of the educational matrix from the perspective of curriculum comprehensiveness, as well as a review of the Student Performance Criteria, as evidenced in the program's exhibition of student work (refer to 2.2 Student Performance Criteria).

e) appropriate entry, progression, and exit standards;

Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members.

f) adequate human, physical, and financial resources to support the program/me;

Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members, and includes a process by which the program's resources are evaluated, within both the review of the APR and the subsequent site visit (refer to 4.1.7 Human Resources, 4.1.8 Physical Resources, 4.1.9 Information Resources, and 4.1.10 Financial Resources).

g) periodic re-evaluation to maintain accreditation/validation/recognition status;

Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members. Specifically, the KAAB requests and reviews, on an annual basis, an Annual Report (AR) from the architecture program, which provides an accounting of the progress the program is making towards addressing the recommendations put forward by the KAAB through the Visiting Team Report (VTR).

h) a period of academic study at, or in association with, a university/tertiary-level institution sufficient to demonstrate skills, abilities, attitudes and

knowledge at a defined standard adequate for initial entry to the
architecture profession; in order to gain the balanced acquisition of
subjects and capabilities, this period of academic study should be not less
than the equivalent of five years full-time studies.

Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members. Specifically, the KAAB defines (3.0 Application for Accreditation, 3.1 Conditions for Application) that an architecture program must be an independent 5-year undergraduate degree program or a minimum 2-year masters (graduate) degree program (in conjunction with a coordinated undergraduate program).

IV. International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE): Guidelines of Good Practice

As External Quality Assurance Agencies (EQAA), signatory systems should
embrace the key principles of the Guidelines of Good Practice (2005 ed.).

The EQAA:

a) has a written mission statement or set of objectives that takes into account
its cultural and historical context.

Met. The Conditions and Procedures developed by the KAAB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members, and features an account of its cultural and historical context in 2.1 KAAB Perspectives on Architectural Education.

b) has adequate and accessible human and financial resources to conduct
external evaluation effectively and efficiently in accordance with its mission
statement and its methodological approach.

Met. The KAAB has a well-established office and facilities with the requisite human and physical resources to offer an accountable and responsive external evaluation framework, in accordance with its stated mission and approach, and in substantial equivalency with other signatory systems of the Canberra Accord.

c) has a system of continuous quality assurance of its own activities that
emphasizes flexibility in response to the changing nature of higher
education, the effectiveness of its operations, and its contribution towards
the achievement of its objectives.

Met. The KAAB has put in place a system of checks and balances, both in terms of its system, within which is a review and appeal process that promotes accountability and transparency within the decision-making process, and in terms of its creation of a Education/Research Committee, that continuously monitors and addresses changes locally and internationally in architectural education. Additionally the KAAB commits to reviewing its Conditions and Procedures every five years.

d) informs and responds to the public in accordance with applicable legislation
and the cultural context of the EQAA.

Met. The KAAB has a well-documented Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation, in print form and as published on the internet. Additionally, the Education/Research Committee is an externally-focused arm of the KAAB that engages in public relations and education, while the Secretariat manages the exchange of information between the KAAB and the public.

e) recognizes that institutional and programmatic quality and quality
assurance are primarily the responsibility of the higher education

institutions themselves; respects the academic autonomy, identity and integrity of the institutions or programs; applies standards or criteria that have been subject to reasonable consultation with stakeholders; and aims to contribute to both quality improvement and accountability of the institution.

Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation has an appropriate level of specificity that both defines the standards required of an architecture program towards meeting professional competency, while at the same time allowing each independent institution the ability to define its own design culture and legibility. Each independent architecture program maintains the sole responsibility for the creation and development of its curriculum.

f) has documents that indicate clearly what the EQAA expects of the institution.

Met. The KAAB has a well-documented Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation, in print form and as published on the internet. Additionally, the Education/Research Committee is an externally-focused arm of the KAAB that actively consults with different architecture programs while the system of Annual Reports allows for continual monitoring and dialogue between the KAAB and the architecture programs (refer to 1. Overview of the Accreditation Process).

g) has documentation concerning self-evaluation which explains the purposes, procedures, process and expectations in the self-evaluation process. The documents also include the standards used, the decision criteria, the reporting format, and other information needed by the higher education institution.

Met. The KAAB has a well-documented Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation, in print form and as published on the internet. Specifically related to the self-evaluation of the architecture programs, the Conditions and Procedures defines the self-evaluation in the form of an Architecture Program Report (APR), and also specifies the associated review process (refer to 1.1 Submission of Application for Accreditation, 1.2 Receipt of Application and Visiting Team Selection, 1.3 Submission of the Architecture Program Report, 1.4 Review of the Architecture Program Report).

h) has clear documentation concerning the external evaluation that states the standards used, assessment methods and processes, decision criteria, and other information necessary for external review.

Met. The KAAB has a well-documented Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation, in print form and as published on the internet. Specifically related to the external evaluation of the architecture programs, the Conditions and Procedures defines the process clearly, including the need and scheduling for the APR, its review, the site visit, the creation of the Visiting Team Report (VTR), its review by the architecture program, the recommendation by the KAAB, and the associated appeal process if necessary (refer to 1.5 Site Visit of the Program, 1.6 Site Visit Evaluation, 1.7 Submission of the Visiting Team Report, 1.8 Deliberation of Terms and Conditions of Accreditation, 1.9 Appeals by the Program).

i) evaluations address both the higher education institution's own self-assessment and external reference points, such as judgments by knowledgeable peers or relevant legislation.

Met. The KAAB has a well-documented Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation, in print form and as published on the internet. Specifically related to the self-evaluation and external evaluation of the architecture programs, the Conditions and Procedures defines the process clearly, including the need, contents, and scheduling for the APR, its review, the site visit, the creation of the Visiting Team Report (VTR), its review by the architecture program, the recommendation by the KAAB, and the associated appeal

process if necessary (refer to 1. Overview of the Accreditation Process).

j) has appropriate methods and policies for appeals.
Met. The KAAB has a well-documented Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation, in print form and as published on the internet. Specifically related to the provision of equity and fair process, the methodology of evaluation includes an appeal process, on the part of the architecture program in disagreeing with the findings of the VTR or the decision on the Accreditation Deliberation, and on the part of the Visiting Team should its findings not be endorsed by the Accrediting Committee. Appeals are heard by an independent arbitration committee (refer to 6.5 Appeals and Arbitration). It should be noted that there exists some inconsistencies in the appeal process that are further discussed in the B.4 g) Conclusion section of this report.

k) collaborates with other EQAAs, if possible, in areas such as exchange of good practices, capacity building, review of decisions, provision of transnational education, joint projects, and staff exchanges.
Met. The KAAB has developed its Conditions and Procedures from a systematic review of international architectural accrediting systems. As well, continuous exchanges of good practice have characterized the past seven years during the development of its system, including the KAAB's initial mock-up accreditations and in the first three accreditations, where international accreditation experts were used strategically in order to inform and evolve its Conditions and Procedures. This practice seems to be an established mode within the KAAB culture at this time.

l) has policies relating to both imported and exported higher education.
N/A The Review Team assessed that the responsibility to comprehensively evaluate the sum total of a student's educational course work in order to meet the accredited architecture program's Student Performance Criteria (SPC) lies with the individual architecture program.

V. UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education
A balance between benchmarking appropriate international standards and encouraging a variety of approaches are central to the principles of the Accord.

• In any system of accreditation/validation/recognition it is of prime importance to establish the standards of achievement to be attained and the means of assessment through peer group review.

• Of equal importance is the need to encourage diversity, innovation, and development.

Signatory systems should ensure the acquisition of generic student skills, knowledge, and competencies including the following, identified in the Charter:

a) An ability to create architectural designs that satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements.
Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student Performance Criteria to be met in terms of an architecture program's design studio sequence (refer to 2.2 Student Performance Criteria).

b) An adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies, and human sciences.
Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student Performance Criteria to be met in terms of history/theory, humanities, and technical

course sequence (refer to 2.2 Student Performance Criteria).

c) Knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural
design.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of the relationship to and importance of fine arts
in its course sequence (refer to 2.2 Student Performance Criteria).*

d) An adequate knowledge of urban design, planning, and the skills involved
in the planning process.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of urban design, planning, and the planning
process in its course and design course sequence (refer to 2.2 Student Performance
Criteria).*

e) An understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and
between buildings and their environment, and of the need to relate
buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of scale in the built environment within its
design course sequence (refer to 2.2 Student Performance Criteria).*

f) An understanding of the profession of architecture and the role of the
architect in society, in particular in preparing briefs that take into account
social factors.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of the role of the architect in society within its
course sequence (refer to 2.2 Student Performance Criteria).*

g) An understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the
brief for a design project.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of programming in its course and design course
sequence (refer to 2.2 Student Performance Criteria).*

h) An understanding of the structural design, constructional, and engineering
problems associated with building design.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of structural design and engineering in its
course and design course sequence (refer to 2.2 Student Performance Criteria).*

i) An adequate knowledge of physical problems and technologies and of the
function of buildings so as to provide them with internal conditions of
comfort and protection against the climate.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of environmental comfort and interior air quality
in its course and design course sequence (refer to 2.2 Student Performance Criteria).*

j) The design skills necessary to meet building users' requirements within the
constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of programming and designing for cost-
effectiveness in its course and design course sequence (refer to 2.2 Student Performance
Criteria).*

k) An adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations, regulations, and
procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and
integrating plans into overall planning.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of professional practice and project delivery in
its course and design course sequence (refer to 2.2 Student Performance Criteria).*

l) Awareness of responsibilities toward human, social, cultural, urban,
architectural, and environmental values, as well as architectural heritage.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of thinking and designing in a social, cultural,
and environmental context within its course and design course sequence (refer to 2.2
Student Performance Criteria).*

m) Adequate knowledge of the means of achieving ecologically sustainable
design and environmental conservation and rehabilitation.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of thinking and designing in an environmental
context as ecological stewards within its course and design course sequence (refer to 2.2
Student Performance Criteria).*

n) Development of a creative competence in building techniques, founded on
a comprehensive understanding of the disciplines and construction
methods related to architecture.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of understanding technical contexts and building
systems towards the ability to integrate this knowledge within a design project through
its course and design course sequence (refer to 2.2 Student Performance Criteria).*

o) Adequate knowledge of project financing, project management, cost
control, and methods of project delivery.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of professional practice, development financing,
and project delivery in its course and design course sequence (refer to 2.2 Student
Performance Criteria).*

p) Training in research techniques as an inherent part of architectural
learning, for both students and teachers.
*Met. The KAAB's Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation defines the Student
Performance Criteria to be met in terms of research means and methods in both course-
based and design-based studies in its course and design course sequence. Faculty
research expectations are defined within the Conditions and Procedures, specifically in
the APR preparation (4.1.11 Research Development).*

B. 4. Commentary

a) Self evaluation by signatory system
[Brief comments on documents provided]
*The KAAB Self Evaluation report was comprehensive and accurately reflected the
structure and requirements of the KAAB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation.
The report contained an overview of the KAAB roles and responsibilities, its Conditions
and Procedures, changes in the KAAB Conditions and Procedures and upcoming tasks.
The stated changes to the C+P will be discussed below.*

The discussion in the report regarding the upcoming tasks was limited to providing an outline on the KAAB process in reviewing and developing changes to the C+P. The report did not present an overview of tasks anticipated in the next 5 years, however, given the ambitious goal of accrediting a further 9 architecture programs in 2010, and facilitating the accreditation of many other programs that wish to prepare themselves for the repercussions related to the planned changes to the Architects Act, it is clear that the KAAB will be immensely busy for some years to come.

There was no mention in the report of any recent challenges to the KAAB and it's procedures. However, the Review Team did enquire from the KAAB and pursued this issue through the review of related documentation of an appeal by an architecture program that was granted a three-year accreditation by the KAAB (VTR, Letter of Appeal, Minutes to the Deliberation by the KAAB Board and Response Letter). The result of the appeal was its rejection by the KAAB on a technical matter.

b) Refer to any changes to system mapped against Accord compliance
criteria (see section 1.0 of Rules and Procedures) and any recent
challenges to system
Part 6.4.1 of the 2005 KAAB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation has been amended in response to the first round of accreditation visits. The change is detailed in the Addendum, Attachment B of this Report. The purpose of the amendment is to introduce the option of a three-year term in addition to the five-year and conditional two-year terms that were already specified. The KAAB assessed that the conditional two-year term did not allow sufficient time and means for an architecture program to address the deficiencies outlined in the VTR.

Additionally, the changes to the C+P include a modification of the accreditation review process, specifically related to the determination of the final decision on accreditation terms. Prior to the change, the final decision regarding the accreditation terms resided entirely on the Accrediting Committee, with the result that there was no recourse if the Accrediting Committee and the Visiting Team had a disagreement on the final decision. To rectify this, the KAAB agreed to have the Board of Directors deliver the final decision, based on a review of both the recommendations of the Visiting Team and the final decision of the Accrediting Committee.

Finally, the Accrediting Committee membership was increased from 7 to 9 members, with the addition of two observers. The changes specified above were seen by the Review Team to promote greater fairness in the review and decision-making process.

c) Other documentation by signatory system
The KAAB provided all the necessary documentation, including all supplementary documents requested by the Review Team. All key documents were translated into English. Where required, Korean language documents were reviewed with the KAAB facilitator in order to ascertain a necessary understanding.

The Review Team was able to access and therefore assess two complete cycles of the KAAB accreditation process, for Seoul National University (a 5-year accredited program) and Hanyang University, Ansan Campus (a 3-year accredited program). In this evaluation, the Review Team was able to follow the accreditation process from Architecture Program Report, Visiting Team Report, Minutes of the Deliberation by the KAAB Board, Letters of Accreditation Term Recommendation, and the related Annual Reports by the architecture programs which sought to address the areas requiring improvement.

In both cases, the process clearly reflected the Conditions and Procedures outlined by the KAAB. The decision-making path was easy to follow and all the participants in the

process (KAAB Committees, Board of Directors, Visiting Teams, Architecture Programs) proactively pursued their associated roles and responsibilities.

Other documents inspected by the Review Team and attached to this report are:
- KAAB Conditions and Procedures for Professional Degree Programs in Architecture.
- KAAB brochure.
- Draft Canberra Accord Review Team Schedule and Agenda.
- Architecture Program Report (APR) for Kookmin University – English excerpt.
- KAAB powerpoint briefing presented to the Review Team on 24th April.
  (The presentation includes important information about the history of the accreditation process and statistics on the number of architects and architecture programs in Korea).
- Spreadsheet of applications, visits and accreditation determinations since the start of the KAAB accreditation program.
- KAAB Guidelines booklet: English excerpt relating to format of Annual Reports.
  (The KAAB Conditions and Procedures document does not specify requirements for Annual Report content and format. The Review Team was advised that these requirements are covered in the supplementary Guidelines booklet).

The following documents were given to the Review Team in hard copy or were tabled for review, but are not annexed to this report:
- Record of Accreditation Candidate appeal 10 Aug 2009 against Board decision and KAAB determination to dismiss.
  (as referred to in B4 a) above).
- Translated meeting minutes of KAAB Accrediting Committee from Fall 2006 to Spring 2010: 'Review and decisions / recommendations for accrediting teams.'
- Annual Reports for all accredited programs since the commencement of the KAAB accreditation process.
  (These documents were not translated, but the facilitator assisted the team to examine the reporting system and specifically the reports from Hanyang University (Ansan) and Seoul National University referred to above).
- Printed copy of powerpoint briefing presented to the Review Team by Seoul National University.
- KAAB Guideline booklet: full Korean edition.

d) Accreditation/validation/recognition visit by signatory system
The Review Team made two visits to Kookmin University, to observe the KAAB Accreditation Visit.

KOOKMIN UNIVERSITY ARCHITECTURE PROGRAM REPORT
The Review Team requested and was provided with an English excerpt of the school's Architecture Program Report (APR). The report included the information required by the KAAB system (refer to Attachment G).

EXHIBITION OF STUDENT WORK
The exhibition of student work was comprehensive and well laid out. Five to seven examples of each studio project were displayed in standardized format, including models. This was a high proportion of work for a relatively small school (approximately 50 students per year for a 5 year program). Low range projects were not initially displayed in the team room as required by the Conditions and Procedures, but were made available after a request from the KAAB Visiting Team Chair. This appeared to be the result of a misunderstanding, as the school requires all final year students to compile an individual book with examples of all projects from each studio over the 5 years of their studies; these were included in the exhibition.

Samples of student work for all other subjects were also exhibited.

PHYSICAL FACILITIES
Architecture is accommodated in a relatively new, purpose-designed building. Studio facilities, seminar and model workshop appear appropriate. Larger workshops were described but not seen by the Review Team. The computer lab appeared small by current standards, but the building is provided with w-fi and students provide their own desktop computers and laptops. The Team observed several seminar and small lecture rooms and one major lecture theatre.

STAFF
The Review Team noted that staff had a range of educational and practice experience. The Team was informed that the staff/student ratio was sufficient to comply with KAAB policy, including the minimum 40 minute contact time per student per week in Design Studio.

MEETING WITH STUDENTS
The Review Team observed the Student meeting. Approximately 200 students attended, with good representation of all years. Although initially very reserved, students were encouraged to speak and soon raised numerous matters. The Review Team were told that student comments are considered by the Visiting Team and inform their report, but that a separate record or minutes of the meeting are not annexed to the report.

The Review Team also visited Seoul National University, where they were briefed on preparations for its next accreditation visit in late 2011.

e) Meetings with representatives of signatory system
The review Team had the following meetings with the KAAB:
* *Arrival meeting with 8.30 am 24th April with Dr Chough, Director of KAAB, and Associate Professor Lee, Associate Director of KAAB and Canberra Accord Review Team Facilitator.*
* *Entrance meeting with KAAB Board at 11.00 on Sunday 25th.*
* *Review of Additional information at KAAB office at 1.00 on Monday 26$^{th.}$ (Rescheduled by the Review team from the original 9.00 time to allow time for a second visit to Kookmin University).*
* *Exit meeting with KAAB at 10.00 on Wednesday 28th.*

The scheduled 9.00 meeting at the KAAB office on Tuesday 27th was not required and was cancelled at the Review Team's request.

Refer to B.1 Introduction and Attachments K and L for detail of items discussed.

f) Overview of criteria, policies, and procedures of the system
[A brief executive summary]
During the last nine years, a group of architects and architectural academics have forged close ties to the international accreditation community and systematically developed the context and expertise for the KAAB as it stands today. The KAAB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation is part of a larger movement in contemporary Korean society to improve and validate the architectural profession, including the key revision to the Architects Act that will entrench architectural accreditation, and the KAAB as the sole accreditation authority, as a prerequisite for architectural registration. Within this context of massive change, the KAAB will be responsible for the accreditation of over 50 architecture programs in the next few years. From all perceived accounts by the Review Team, all stakeholders in this process, including the regulatory bodies and the academic institutions, are prepared and willing to make this process successful.

Through a comprehensive review of the KAAB documents and the attendance of a Accreditation Visit and further architecture program visit framed by the review of the

related documentation of its APR, VTR, and AR from the last 3 years, it is clear to the Review Team that the KAAB criteria, policies, and procedures are consistent, progressive, and well-managed.

This is apparent not only in the documents themselves, specifically the KAAB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation, but also in the policies put into practice, as evidenced through the visit and review of two architecture programs and the clear effect of the documented review and information exchange process. In other words, the checks and balances outlined in the C+P have been successful not only as a process but also to facilitate constructive changes to the architecture programs and their capacity to offer a comprehensive professional architectural education.

g) Conclusion
[Identify critical issues for the system in the near future (1-5 years)]
In the broadest terms, the critical issue facing the KAAB centers around the massive change enacted upon the accreditation system as a result of the new Architects Act. In order to successfully manage the volume of accreditation needs, the KAAB will need to continue to aggressively develop and expand its pool of accreditation visit team members, while maintaining the quality and consistency of its management capabilities to ensure a uniform and equitable process.

There are three issues that have surfaced from the review of the accreditation documents and the related visits to architecture programs. The first has to do with the effectiveness of the annual reporting mechanism. Currently, although Annual Reports are requested by the KAAB and created by the architecture programs involved in accreditation, there is no established and documented mechanism that monitors and provides feedback on the Annual Reports, and by extension, any progress or lack of progress on the part of the architecture program. A simple feedback mechanism on the part of the KAAB would provide key closure on the process for the architecture programs and a higher degree of accountability.

Secondly, the appeal process, although a key part of the accountability of the overall review and decision-making process, needs clarification and documentation within the KAAB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation. Currently, it is not clear when appeals are allowed and under what circumstances they are warranted.

Finally, as a means to promote and represent a greater diversity and inclusivity, the composition of the Visiting Team, which currently balances practitioners and academics, could also include a student member and/or an architectural intern member, such that the views and relative experiences in the Visiting Team are more diversified and therefore can collectively express a broader perspective on accreditation matters.

B. 5. Attachments
a) Documentation provided prior to the review visit
[List only; full documentation will be posted electronically]
A   *KAAB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation; Professional Degree Programs in Architecture.*
B   *Addendum to KAAB Conditions and Procedures.*
C   *KAAB brochure.*
D   *KAAB Self Evaluation Report.*
E   *Draft CA Review Schedule and Agenda.*
F   *CV for KAAB Facilitator Associate Professor Junsuk Lee.*

b) Additional information supplied during the review visit
[List only; full documentation will be posted electronically]

G   *Architecture Program Report (APR) for Kookmin University – English excerpt.*
H   *KAAB powerpoint briefing presented to the Review Team on 24th April.*
I   *List of applications, visits and accreditation determinations since the start of the KAAB accreditation program.*
J   *KAAB Guidelines booklet: English excerpt relating to content and format of Annual Reports.*

c) Review visit agenda and record of meetings
[Synopsis only]
K   *Minutes of Review Team Entrance Meeting with KAAB on 25th April.*
L   *Minutes of meeting at KAAB on 26th April.*
    (The visit agenda is included as attachment D above).

A selection Photographs taken by Review Team and by the KAAB administrator are also attached.

Refer to B4 c) above for other documents that were provided to the Review Team in hard copy or were tabled for review, but are not attached to this report.

B. 6. Report Signatures

_____

Professor Paul Berkemeier
Accord Reviewer Representing Practice

_____

Associate Professor Marc Boutin
Accord Reviewer Representing Education