

CONFIDENTIAL

Canberra Accord on Architectural Education

Type of Report: **Periodic Review**

Korea Architectural Accrediting Board

Dates of Review Visit: April 28-May 4, 2016

Date of Review Report: May 10, 2016

Status/Edition: **DRAFT**

B.1 Introduction

a) Summary

The Korea Architectural Accrediting Board underwent its six year periodic review April 29-May 4, 2016 in Seoul and Busan, Korea.

The purpose of the review is to determine whether the conditions and procedures of the KAAB system for accreditation of professional degrees in architecture meet the standards set by the Accord.

The visit began with dinner with the **KAAB** delegates. On May 1, the reviewers met to review their **mandate** and organize their thoughts as the visit commenced. The team met with the KAAB delegates at the KAAB headquarters in Seoul, where they received an overview of the organization and its operations. The team then traveled to Busan.

The team traveled to **Pusan National University** where they met with the University President and the accreditation team assigned to review the College. During the observation period, May 2nd and May 3rd, the team observed an all student meeting, meetings with full and part time faculty, toured the exhibits in the team room, toured the facilities, and visited some studios in progress.

On May 4th, the team returned to Seoul and met with the **Korea Institute of Registered Architects (KIRA)**, and the **Korean Architectural Registration Board (KARB)**. The exit meeting with the KAAB was conducted on May 4th at 11:00 AM.

- b) The reviewers were Patricia Belton Oliver, FAIA, Dean, University of Houston, Canberra Accord Academic representative from the United States, and Sithabile Mathe, MNAL, MAAB, MBIDP, Managing Director Moralo Designs, Practice Canberra Accord representative from Botswana from the signatory of Commonwealth Association of Architects.

B.2. Recommendation

a) Recommendation to Canberra Accord signatory systems:

1. that the Korea Architectural Accrediting Board 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.

b) Operational and educational output standards

The operational and output standards of the KAAB were found to be substantially equivalent to those of other signatory systems in the Canberra Accord.

c) Compliance with criteria for substantial equivalence

We have determined that the KAAB are in compliance with criteria for substantial equivalence.

B.3. Characteristics, Principles and Criteria for Assessing Substantial Equivalency

I. General Characteristics

Organizations running accreditation 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 or recognizing programs designed to satisfy the academic requirements for admission to the profession in the locality where accreditation, validation or recognition takes place, subject to additional requirements imposed by local regulations and practice requirements;
- b) be independent of the academic institutions, professional organizations, and government agencies delivering accredited programs within their jurisdiction;
- c) have an active, robust accreditation system in place, with established processes, procedures, and practices that are well-documented;
- d) have a record of accomplishment in accreditation with sufficient experience and magnitude of operation (normally a minimum of five programs over at least seven years).

Finding: The reviewers have determined that the KAAB has met all of the General Characteristics of the Canberra Accord.

II. Common Agreed Principles

Systems for the accreditation of architecture programs 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;

- b) the process must be transparent and consistent;
- c) the activities must be conducted in relation to individual programs in confidence and with firmly established procedures and conditions for objective and consistent evaluation;
- d) those involved in the accreditation process must be knowledgeable and competent in matters related to architectural accreditation, education, and practice;
- e) accreditation is of individual programs/academic awards/qualifications and not of institutions;
- f) evaluations of specified academic programs are conducted by peer reviewers and must include review of the program's self-evaluation documents, a site visit, and inspection of student work;
- g) the standard of students' work should be the main criterion in determining accreditation;
- h) levels of physical, financial, human, and information resources should be appropriate to the context of the institution.

Finding: All common agreed principles apply.

III. Criteria for Accreditation, Validation or Recognition

The criteria for accreditation, validation or recognition should address the following:

- a) a suitable environment to deliver the program;
- b) adequate leadership for the program;
- c) a team of suitably qualified people teaching in the program;
- d) a curriculum providing a broad preparation for architectural practice;
- e) appropriate entry, progression, and exit standards;
- f) adequate human, physical, and financial resources to support the program;
- g) periodic re-evaluation to maintain accreditation status;
- 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 normally not less than the equivalent of five years full-time studies.

Finding: All criteria for accreditation, validation or recognition have been met.

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* published by INQAAHE (revised edition 2006).

The EQAA:

- a) has a written mission statement or set of objectives that takes into account its cultural and historical context.
- 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.
- 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.
- c) informs and responds to the public in accordance with applicable legislation and the cultural context of the EQAA.
- d) 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.
- e) has documents that indicate clearly what the EQAA expects of the institution.
- f) 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.

- g) 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.
- h) evaluations address both the higher education institution's own self-assessment and external reference points, such as judgments by knowledgeable peers or relevant legislation.
- i) has appropriate methods and policies for appeals.
- 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.
- l) has policies relating to both imported and exported higher education.

Findings: The team had some concerns that the KAAB system can sustain a structure with such a high degree of volunteerism as the KAAB continues to grow and extend their accreditation processes to foreign components. The reviewers recommend instituting a five-year plan addressing this vulnerability.

The Accreditation Task Force Committee of the KAAB accepts application for accreditation and initiates the organization of a site visit team and informs the site visit team members of their responsibilities and obligations. The Accreditation Task Force Committee initiates the preparation for the visit process. The Accrediting Committee of the KAAB deliberates and decides on the terms and conditions of accreditation based on the data and information submitted. The decision of the Accrediting Committee is submitted to the Board of Directors for the final decision. The Accreditation Task Force Committee and the Accrediting Committee are volunteers appointed by the Board of Directors.

With the exception of Guideline B, the reviewers found that the system complies with the Guidelines of Good Practice of the INQAAHE.

V. UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education

A balance between benchmarking appropriate international standards and encouraging a variety of approach are central to the principles of the Accord.

- In any system of accreditation 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 *UNESCO-UIA Charter*:

- a) an ability to create architectural designs that satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements.
- b) an adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies, and human sciences.
- c) knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design.
- d) an adequate knowledge of urban design, planning, and the skills involved in the planning process.
- 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.
- 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.
- g) an understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project.
- h) an understanding of the structural design, constructional, and engineering problems associated with building design.
- 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.
- j) the design skills necessary to meet building users' requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations.
- k) an adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations, regulations, and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into overall planning.

And, that the following special points be considered in the development of a curriculum:

- l) awareness of responsibilities toward human, social, cultural, urban, architectural, and environmental values, as well as architectural heritage.

- m) adequate knowledge of the means of achieving ecologically sustainable design and environmental conservation and rehabilitation.
- n) development of a creative competence in building techniques, founded on a comprehensive understanding of the disciplines and construction methods related to architecture.
- o) adequate knowledge of project financing, project management, cost control, and methods of project delivery.
- p) training in research techniques as an inherent part of architectural learning, for both students and teachers.

Findings: While the reviewers were only able to visit one institution undergoing accreditation, based on the relative ranking of that program, and the discussion and information provided by the KAAB staff, the accreditation team, and observations, we sense that the continuing efforts to foster "design" sensibilities is desirable. The KAAB advanced to this point in time with impressive speed having only begun their accreditation processes in 2005. Traditionally, the programs in architecture have been four-year engineering-based programs. As the new five-year professional architecture programs continue to mature, the reviewers encourage the KAAB to consider how to aid the schools to raise their standards of design education and broaden the students' exposure to multiple design methodologies.

With the exception of Standard a, the reviewers felt that the KAAB maintained the standards of the UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education.

B. 4. Commentary

- a) Self evaluation by signatory system

The self-evaluation by the KAAB was well written, thorough and informative. The KAAB was straightforward and forthcoming with reports of their progress and responses to the previous visit.

- 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

There were no changes to the system that would impact Accord compliance and there have been no challenges to the system.

- c) Other documentation by signatory system

Documentation provided included the KAAB Self-evaluation Report, the KAAB Conditions and Procedures, the KAAB 2015 pamphlet, the KAAB Site Visit Guidelines, and the Accrediting Committee's Meeting Minutes 2012-2016.

d) Accreditation visit by signatory system

As indicated in our summary, the reviewers were able to visit the Pusan National University during their accreditation visit for the five year professional degree. The visit appeared to be well organized and the materials were well presented. The meeting with the students was lively and informative. The accreditation team was cooperative and willing to share their observations.

e) Meetings with representatives of signatory system

The reviewers met with the leadership and representatives of the Korean Institute of Registered Architects, the Korea Architectural Registration Board, and the Korea Architectural Accrediting Board.

f) Overview of criteria, policies, and procedures of the system

The system is modeled after the US NAAB system. The policies and criteria are thorough and have been tailored to meet the needs of the Korean architectural education system. The KAAB has been responsive to previous visits and has adopted policies to respond to the handling of annual reports. They have also put new policy in place to accommodate grievances and appeals, although these policies have yet to be employed.

e) Conclusion

The reviewers felt that the KAAB was extremely helpful and thorough in their presentations and their openness was much appreciated. Discussions were honest and candid. The KAAB administration is dedicated and capable. The accreditation team was knowledgeable and dedicated to their task. The team leader was engaging and accessible. The reviewers were treated with respect and cordiality.

The reviewers felt it necessary to comment on the following issues:

The reviewers felt that the KAAB would benefit from producing a five year plan to study the options for shoring up what the reviewers felt was a vulnerability in the structure of the KAAB. Heavy dependence on volunteers within the KAAB operations pointed to a potential structural weakness as more and more schools are accredited, more foreign schools seek accreditation, and the cycles of re-accreditation, as well as potential issues of grievance or appeals become a reality. With this inevitable growth it would be prudent to study the financial implications of a larger permanent staff to assist with accreditation schedules, team formation, VTR reviews, among other activities.

The reviewers were only able to visit one institution going through the accreditation process. However, based on discussions and interchange with the accreditation team and others, we were concerned that the evolution toward a stronger design education needs to be further encouraged. The reviewers

encourage the KAAB to work with the schools to increase the exposure to a variety of design methodologies and theoretical explorations.

The reviewers felt that there remains a level of insularity of the architecture programs. There is a need for more exposure and exchange. If PNU was an example, it is difficult to have exchange programs and visiting lectureships. One of the stated missions of the KAAB was to make sure that architecture education provided a means for participation by Korean graduates in the Global community. Travel and collaboration across borders and internationally would be important to support that intention.

Research is another area that the reviewers felt could be introduced into the schools. Research agenda are means for introducing collaboration and could provide funding for other programmatic needs within the schools.

Diversity was another concern. At PNU, the tenure/tenure-track faculty members were all male. Since the student population presents itself as nearly 50% female, it would be desirable to have the faculty reflect the student body to some degree.

Previous concerns of the visiting team:

It was recommended that the KAAB include a student member on the visiting accreditation teams. At this early stage in their development, there is not yet a student organization that would help to support this effort. The reviewers recognize that the implementation of this is challenging until such a student organization can be formed. While it brings diversity to the team, the reviewers were not terribly concerned that slow growth had not yet allowed this to occur.

The Self Evaluation Report indicates that the KAAB has addressed the issue of annual reports as presented in the last visit. Policies have been put in place to provide feedback for annual reporting.

Policies have also been put in place to handle arbitration and appeals. At this time the system has not yet been tested.

The reviewers would like to thank the KAAB for making our visit so thorough and enjoyable in every way. We can leave with confidence that the KAAB will continue to uphold the standards and intentions of the Canberra Accord.

B.6. Report Signatures

Accord Reviewer Representing Practice

Accord Reviewer Representing Education

Local Facilitator (observer of above signatures)