KOREA ARCHITECTURAL ACCREDITING BOARD

2025
Site Visit Guideline

KA AB

2025

Korea Architectural Accrediting Board

2025 Site Visit Guideline

CONTENTS

3. Considerations for Preparing the Accreditation Site Visit

4. Accreditation Site Visit Q&A

2025
Site Visit Guideline

Introduction

The architecture program applying for accreditation must not only operate its curriculum in full compliance with the KAAB Conditions for Accreditation but also ensure that each student meets both the Criteria of Common Values and the Student Performance Criteria before graduation. The visit team verifies compliance with each accreditation condition set as a minimum standard through an on-site review. However, regardless of how outstanding a program's performance may be in certain areas, its strengths in one area cannot compensate for deficiencies in another - this is a fundamental principle of accreditation review.

The level of achievement and methods for meeting accreditation conditions may vary by architecture program, and the evaluation methods and criteria may also differ depending on the visit team. Therefore, the purpose of this Site Visit Guideline is to provide clear instructions to the visit team chair and visit team members regarding evaluation methods, review procedures, visit team report preparation, and the academic administration and management of programs under review. By doing so, this guideline ensures a consistent evaluation process across all architecture programs seeking accreditation.

A KAAB-accredited professional degree in architecture has become a mandatory requirement for practical training eligibility under the Architect Act and for taking the architectural licensure examination. Furthermore, it will serve as a key qualification for international mutual recognition of architect licensure and registration. As a result, accreditation of architecture programs is of great significance both domestically and internationally. To uphold this standard, KAAB strives to verify - to the fullest extent possible - that all graduates of accredited programs meet the minimum educational requirements set forth by the accreditation system.

The KAAB Conditions for Accreditation serve as the fundamental guideline for the accreditation review process. Apart from the accreditation conditions, this Site Visit Guideline functions as supplementary material to the KAAB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation, assisting both the visit team chair and visit team members in carrying out on-site evaluation tasks and aiding programs in preparing for accreditation. In cases where there is any discrepancy between the KAAB Conditions for Accreditation and this Site Visit Guideline, the KAAB Conditions for Accreditation shall take precedence.

To understand the contents of this Site Visit Guideline, it is necessary to comprehend the following aspects:

- Background of the KAAB's establishment

- Purpose of accreditation for professional degree programs in architecture

- KAAB Conditions for Accreditation and Procedures

- Accreditation procedures before, during, and after the accreditation site visit

- Purpose and contents of the Visit Team Report (VTR)

The purpose of accreditation review is to encourage the maintenance of a high level of education by allowing external experts to assess and provide feedback on the program's unique educational objectives, curriculum, and learning outcomes. The site visit serves not only to verify the contents of the Architecture Program Report (APR) but also to gain insights into aspects that cannot be fully understood through document review alone. Therefore, all agenda items addressed during the site visit are structured to ensure a proper understanding of the program through direct engagement with its members and on-site observations.

A three-night, four-day (revised to two-night, three-day) site visit period is not sufficient to fully grasp the characteristics of the program. To thoroughly understand the program's unique educational structure and objectives, conduct an outcome-based assessment centered on student achievements, engage in evaluations involving program members, and prepare the VTR and confidential recommendation without any disruptions, all visit team members must carefully review the relevant documents provided by the program in advance and make thorough preparations before the site visit.

The Interpretation of Student Performance Criteria (SPC), which was included in the 2013 Site Visit Guideline, has been omitted from the 2019 Site Visit Guideline. Although this document was intended as a supplementary reference to explain the implications and intent of the Student Performance Criteria, its use in accreditation reviews led to unintended consequences - some programs applied the wording and terminology from the interpretation as accreditation criteria, increasing the burden on programs preparing for accreditation and causing unnecessary disputes between the visit team and the program. To prevent such issues, the interpretation has been excluded from the guidelines. However, for reference, the 2013 Site Visit Guideline, which includes the Interpretation of SPC, is available on the KAAB website.

The 2025 Site Visit Guideline has been revised to incorporate newly introduced conditions for accreditation and evaluation methods from the recently updated 2024 Conditions & Procedures while also addressing previously insufficient aspects.

The key updates include:

- Detailed verification items for each agenda in the accreditation site visit schedule (Revised)

- Criteria for determining Met, Not Met, and Requiring Improvement

- Guidelines for evaluating Student Performance Criteria (SPC)

- Evaluation guidelines for newly introduced educational approaches and learning outcomes

- Accreditation consultation

- Matrix of Core Competencies and Student Performance Criteria

- Guidelines for operating interdisciplinary and flexible academic programs such as an open major program

1. Key Issues in Accreditation Site Visit

1.1 Accreditation Visit Schedule and Agenda

The visit team chair must ensure that visit team members and observers are aware of the detailed review items for each agenda item to facilitate a successful and efficient accreditation site visit. Visit team members and observers must verify each item according to the agenda. The schedule and agenda for each visit may be adjusted in advance through consultation with the visit team chair, depending on the circumstances and preparedness of the program.

1.1.1 Detailed Checkpoints for Accreditation Visit Schedule and Agenda

▼ **Day 1 of the Visit (Sunday Morning)**

1) Entrance Meeting of the Visit Team

- Introduction of visit team members (including observers), their backgrounds, areas of interest, and expertise

- Explanation of accreditation site visit protocols

- Determination of the roles and scope of participation for observers

- Emphasis on the principle that all evaluation items should be agreed upon through discussion and consultation, with decisions made by majority vote if necessary

- Assignment of evaluation items to visit team members based on their areas of interest and expertise, ensuring complementary review among members

- Compilation and organization of questions regarding the Architecture Program Report (APR)

- Discussion on the agenda for the day's visit

- Individual signing of the accreditation site visit pledge

  ※ Note: Explanation of the authority and actions the visit team chair may take in case of non-compliance with visit protocols

2) Initial Program Visit

- Introduction of the applying program's faculty and the visit team

- Overview of the applying program's educational curriculum

- Detailed explanation of the display methods and contents in the visit team workroom

- Explanation of the design studio objectives and curriculum by academic year and semester

- Verification that the displayed content and methods comply with the accreditation conditions and the visit team chair's requests

- Confirmation of the provision of all necessary materials required for the accreditation visit

- Announcement that access to the visit team workroom is restricted to external personnel and that entry for cleaning, errands, or other purposes requires prior approval from the visit team chair

※ Note: Ensure that the program introduction and exhibition explanations are conducted within the allotted time.

3) Meeting with Program Representatives and Faculty

- Raise pre-organized key questions and points of interest.

- For initial accreditation, review relevant documents related to issues identified during candidacy and accreditation application reviews, and request additional materials if necessary.

- For continuing accreditation, inquire about deficiencies and related matters pointed out in the previous visit.

- Team members may ask questions in rotation or the team chair and designated members may lead the discussion.

- Observe the program's initial responses to the inquiries and assess potential weaknesses and strengths.

※ Note: Even if deficiencies or inadequacies are identified during the meeting, avoid personal opinions or judgments, as this is not a session for announcing evaluation results.

4) Alumni Meeting

- Explain the purpose of the meeting to foster an open discussion atmosphere and observe alumni perspectives on the program (limited to graduates of professional degree programs).

- Gather opinions on the program's strengths to encourage dialogue and collect information about the school and program.

- Listen to alumni suggestions for program improvement, including curriculum and other aspects, as well as weaknesses and areas needing improvement.

※ Note: Alumni participants should be from a range of 1 to 5 years post-graduation, and participation of individuals working in various fields beyond architecture firms (e.g., further studies, other industries) is encouraged.

※ Note: Avoid interrogation-style questioning focused solely on identifying weaknesses; instead, guide the discussion toward constructive suggestions for program improvement.

5) Review of Exhibition Materials

- Conduct evaluation tasks assigned in advance to each team member.

- Discuss and compile first-round inquiries and requests for additional materials.

- Explain and submit the compiled findings to the program representatives.

※ Note: The visit team chair monitors the progress of each member's assigned tasks and determines whether continued review of exhibition materials is necessary after dinner.

6) Visit Team's End-of-Day Review Meeting and Dinner Discussion

- Collect and discuss first impressions of the program visit.

- Share initial impressions of the exhibition in the visit team workroom.

- Review issues identified so far.

- Exchange opinions on assigned review items.

- Prepare additional document requests for the program if needed.

- Program representatives are not permitted to attend the dinner.

▼ Day 2 of the Visit (Monday)

1) Visit Team Meeting

- Prepare for the day's agenda and activities.

- Organize discussion points and assign roles for meetings with the university president and the student body.

- As time for document review is limited, remind members to continuously assess their assigned evaluation criteria during all activities.

- Check pending questions for faculty members.

- Prepare additional document requests for the program.

2) Meeting with the University's Senior Administration (President & Administrative Officers)

- Introduce the visit team members.

- Explain the significance and necessity of accreditation, the visit schedule, and the composition of the visit team (balance of professionals and educators).

- Introduce KAAB's national and international standing and activities.

- Emphasize that this is not merely an evaluation but also an advisory process aimed at program development.

- Assess the role and position of the architecture program within the university.

- Verify the university's level of understanding and support for the architecture program.

- Understand the university's future development plans and how they may impact the architecture program.

- The team may ask prepared questions, but the meeting primarily focuses on gathering the president's perspectives.

※ Note: This is not a session for pointing out deficiencies or necessary improvements in the program.

※ Note: Politely request that the president or administrative officers visit the accreditation exhibition during the visit to enhance their understanding of architectural education and accreditation.

3) Meeting with All Enrolled Students

- Ensure that no program representatives are present.

- Introduce the visit team members.

- Explain the purpose and significance of accreditation, the visit schedule, and the composition of the visit team.

- Introduce KAAB's national and international standing.

- Emphasize that this is an advisory process aimed at program improvement rather than a simple evaluation.

- Foster an open discussion atmosphere to encourage engagement.

- Gather student opinions on the program's strengths and advantages, facilitating dialogue and collecting information about the school and program.

- Confirm whether the program has adequately explained the accreditation process and its connection to architectural licensure.

- Assess student participation in extracurricular activities, external engagement opportunities, and satisfaction with seminars or lectures.

- Understand students' perceptions of their department and university, sense of belonging, career outlooks, and interest in pursuing an architectural license.

- Gather student opinions on the program and faculty.

- Identify any difficulties students face in faculty interactions.

- Assess whether there are concerns about the curriculum.

- Verify whether students have opportunities to take courses outside the architecture program and their enrollment status in other departments' courses.

- Collect feedback on studio selection and assignment processes, as well as suggestions for improving physical facilities.

- Gather any recommendations students wish to make to the school.

- Prioritize listening to student feedback and minimize comments from visit team members.

※ Note: Avoid interrogation-style questioning focused solely on weaknesses; instead, guide the discussion toward constructive suggestions for program improvement.

※ Note: If necessary, divide into small groups for discussions and coordinate with the program in advance to secure appropriate spaces.

4) Meeting with Adjunct Faculty

- Explain the purpose of the meeting to foster an open discussion and gather adjunct faculty perspectives on the program.

- Begin the discussion by collecting opinions on the program's strengths to encourage dialogue and gather information.

- Verify whether adjunct faculty members understand the intended educational objectives of their courses and whether instruction aligns with these goals (including the coordination and communication between full-time and adjunct faculty).

- Assess the proportion and characteristics of adjunct faculty who are graduates of the university, noting any advantages or disadvantages.

- Collect adjunct faculty suggestions for program improvements (e.g., curriculum operations, working conditions), as well as weaknesses and areas needing improvement.

※ Note: Avoid interrogation-style questioning focused solely on weaknesses; instead, guide discussions toward practical suggestions for improving architectural education from a professional perspective.

5) Facility Tour

- Inspect book collections in the central library and department library, including the lending system and loan status.

- Review the budget for purchasing architecture-related books and plans for future support, including dedicated personnel.

- Assess overall facility conditions.

- Review infrastructure and physical resources (e.g., heating/cooling systems, available space) as assigned to each team member.

- Verify the availability and safety management system of model-making facilities and equipment.

- Check accessibility, operating hours, and ease of use for model-making rooms, computer labs, printing facilities, and studio spaces.

※ Note: For continuing accreditation, focus on improvements made since the last visit and issues raised in student discussions. If appropriate, assessment may be conducted based on documents alone.

6) Design Studio, Lecture, and Seminar Observations

- Conduct an on-site assessment of teaching environments.

- Verify that design education is being conducted effectively and gather information through discussions with students in studios.

- If necessary, assign selected team members to observations while others continue reviewing materials.

※ Note: If needed, facility tours and class observations may be conducted concurrently.

7) Continued Review of Exhibition Materials

- Convene a meeting before dinner to consolidate individual evaluations of assigned items.

- Verify additional document requests and review pending questions for faculty.

- Conduct a second round of discussions on items that do not meet accreditation conditions.

- Compile additional inquiries and document requests for the program regarding non-compliant or insufficiently addressed areas.

※ Note: The visit team chair monitors task completion and determines whether continued review of exhibition materials is necessary after dinner.

8) Visit Team Dinner Discussion

- Ensure that no program representatives are present.

- Summarize and discuss the day's site visit findings.

- Emphasize key tasks and priorities for the final day of the visit.

▼ Day 3 of the Visit (Tuesday)

1) Visit Team Meeting

- Prepare for the day's schedule and agenda.

- Ensure that all items identified as Not Met or Requiring Improvement must be addressed and clarified with the program before the end of the day.

- Compile a final list of Not Met, Requiring Improvement, or reconsideration items.

- Assign roles and structure the questioning for the final meeting with faculty in the afternoon.

- If necessary, prepare additional requests for documents or explanations from the program in the morning.

2) Review of Exhibition Materials

- Conduct individual evaluations of assigned criteria and draft the preliminary Visiting Team Report (VTR).

3) Final Meeting with Faculty

- Emphasize that this session serves as the final opportunity for the visit team to verify outstanding questions and for the program to provide final clarifications.

- The visit team chair and designated team members will address all Not Met or reconsideration items by presenting questions to the faculty members responsible for those areas.

※ Notes:
  o This meeting should focus on resolving differences in the interpretation of accreditation conditions and responses, rather than engaging in debates or unilateral assertions.

  o The visit team must provide clear opinions while ensuring the program has a fair opportunity to explain its position. However, discussions should be conducted efficiently within the allocated time.

  o If there are significant discrepancies in understanding between the visit team and the program, discussions may become overly heated or defensive. In such cases, the visit team chair should de-escalate tensions by concluding discussions with statements like:
  "We will evaluate this criterion based on the explanation and materials provided by the program," or
  "We will review this criterion again before finalizing our assessment."

4) Final Review of Exhibition Materials

- Conduct a final review of materials related to items addressed during the faculty meeting.

- Draft individual sections of the VTR.

- If discrepancies arise among visit team members, the visit team chair will facilitate a collective review of exhibition materials to reach a final decision.

5) Visit Team Dinner Meeting

- If necessary, have dinner in the visit team workroom.

- Provide instructions on drafting the VTR and the Confidential Recommendation Report (CRR).

6) Drafting of the Visiting Team Report (VTR)

- Review all collected data and summarize the program's overall strengths and weaknesses.

- Consolidate evaluation results for each accreditation criterion, compile necessary comments, and edit the final draft.

- Finalize all report content based on consensus among team members; in case of difficulty reaching an agreement, the team chair may mediate or call for a majority vote.

- If confidentiality is deemed necessary for specific discussions, decide on observer participation accordingly.

- The visit team collectively determines the final evaluations and justifications for each criterion and drafts the first summary page of the VTR, which will be presented to the program during the exit meeting.

※ Note: If any items were identified as deficiencies in the faculty meeting without an opportunity for clarification, an additional inquiry must be conducted to allow the program to respond.

7) Drafting of the Confidential Recommendation Report (CRR)

- Ensure that all observers are excluded from this process.

- Clarify that the CRR is not the final accreditation decision but rather the visit team's recommendation on accreditation status and term, which will be submitted to KAAB.

- Provide each visit team member an opportunity to voice their final opinions.

- Strive for consensus on the final recommendation; if consensus is not possible, adhere to the pre-announced majority vote procedure.

- Draft and sign the CRR.

- Emphasize the importance of confidentiality regarding the CRR and warn of the severe consequences of breaching confidentiality.

▼ **Day 4 of the Visit (Wednesday)**

1) Visit Team Meeting

- Prepare for the day's schedule and agenda.

- Emphasize that during the exit meetings with faculty, the university president, and all program members, visit team members must refrain from responding to questions about evaluation results (e.g., accreditation term, status, etc.).

- Stress the importance of maintaining confidentiality by properly organizing and discarding all evaluation records and meeting materials.

2) Exit Meeting with Program Representatives and Faculty

- Express appreciation for the program's efforts in preparing for the visit.

- Clearly explain all identified issues and the rationale behind the assessments as stated in the VTR.

- Provide the summary page of the VTR to the program representatives.

- While visit team members are not obligated to answer faculty questions regarding evaluation content, they may choose to respond as appropriate.

- Inform the program of the next steps and timeline in the accreditation process.

※ Note: The delivery of the summary page signifies a commitment that, once the visit is concluded and the visit team disbands, the results will not be arbitrarily modified beyond the program's ability to respond.

3) Exit Meeting with the University President and Senior Administrators

- Guide them through the exhibition and explain the displayed content.

- Express gratitude for the university's support in preparing for the visit.

- Summarize the program's overall strengths and weaknesses identified during the accreditation visit.

- Provide and explain the summary page of the VTR.

- Primarily focus on gathering the president's perspectives; visit team members are not required to answer questions but may choose to do so if deemed appropriate.

※ Note: The applying program's representative may provide additional explanations about the exhibition if necessary.

4) Cleanup of the Visit Team Workroom

- Collect personal belongings and dispose of all meeting-related materials.

- Sign travel expense forms.

- Provide instructions on drafting and submitting the Work Opinion Statement.

5) Exit Briefing for All Program Members

- Express appreciation for the program's efforts in preparing for the visit.

- Summarize the program's overall strengths and weaknesses identified during the accreditation visit.

- Publicly present the summary page of the VTR.

- Each visit team member shares final remarks and words of encouragement.

- No questions will be taken, and the visit team will exit promptly to conclude the official schedule.

6) Visit Team Disbandment

- The visit team will have lunch outside the university, ensuring that no university representatives are present.

- Reiterate the confidentiality principles regarding all accreditation visit details.

- Provide final notifications about post-visit procedures and timelines.

※ Note: After the conclusion of the accreditation visit, individual or group meals with program representatives or acceptance of transportation assistance are considered violations of accreditation protocols.

1.1.2 Revised Detailed Checkpoints for Accreditation Visit Schedule and Agenda

The revised accreditation site visit schedule and agenda have been developed to reduce the burden on both the applying program in preparing for the accreditation visit and the visit team in conducting their evaluation. The previous schedule, which began on Sunday morning, has been adjusted to start on Saturday evening, while the conclusion of the visit has been moved from Wednesday morning to Tuesday morning.

Under this revised schedule:

- The visit team will follow a four-day, three-night schedule (Saturday evening to Tuesday morning).

- The applying program will follow a three-day, two-night schedule (Sunday to Tuesday morning).

This revised schedule will undergo pilot testing and feedback collection, after which one of the following three options will be implemented:

1. Full adoption of the revised schedule.

2. Modification and implementation of the revised schedule.

3. Retention of the current schedule.

However, the following programs will continue to follow the original schedule and agenda, regardless of the implementation of the revised version:

- Programs applying for initial accreditation.

- Programs that did not receive a six-year accreditation in their previous accreditation review.

The detailed review items for each agenda under the revised schedule follow those outlined in Section 1.1.1.

▼ Day 1 of the Visit (Saturday Afternoon)

1. Entrance Meeting of the Visit Team (Orientation)

2. Visit Team Dinner Meeting

▼ Day 2 of the Visit (Sunday)

1. Initial Program Visit

2. Meeting with Program Representatives and Faculty

3. Alumni Meeting

4. Review of Exhibition Materials
   o Compile additional inquiries and document requests for program clarification if any items are identified as Not Met or Requiring Improvement.

5. Facility Tour

6. End-of-Day Review Meeting and Dinner Discussion

   ※ Note: The visit team chair will assess individual task progress and determine if additional exhibition material review is required after dinner.

▼ Day 3 of the Visit (Monday)

1. Visit Team Meeting

2. Continued Review of Exhibition Materials
   o Compile additional inquiries and document requests for program clarification.

3. Meeting with All Enrolled Students

4. Final Meeting with Faculty
   o Review responses and explanations provided for questions and document requests from the previous day.
   o Address additional inquiries.

5. Final Review of Exhibition Materials and Individual Drafting of the Visiting Team Report (VTR)

6. Visit Team Dinner Meeting (if necessary)

7. Drafting of the Visiting Team Report (VTR)

8. Drafting of the Confidential Recommendation Report (CRR)

Changes in this revised schedule:

- The initial meeting with the university's senior administration (president and administrative officers) has been removed and replaced with an exit meeting.

- The meeting with adjunct faculty has been removed.

▼ Day 4 of the Visit (Tuesday Morning)

1. Visit Team Meeting

2. Exit Meeting with Program Representatives and Faculty (Presentation of Visit Findings)

3. Exit Meeting with University President and Senior Administrators
   o Introduction to accreditation exhibition content (Program representatives may provide explanations if necessary).
   o Explanation of the significance and necessity of accreditation, visit schedule, and visit team composition (balance of professionals and educators) to the university president.

※ Note: The remaining procedures follow the original format.

4. Cleanup of the Visit Team Workroom

5. Exit Briefing for All Program Members

6. Disbandment of the Visit Team

1.2 Evaluation of Accreditation Criteria

The visit team evaluates a total of 30 detailed items categorized into three parts: KAAB Perspectives on Architectural Education, Educational Program and Resources, and Learning Outcome. These are further divided into a total of seven accreditation criteria.

1.2.1 Task Allocation

The visit team chair verifies the expertise and areas of interest of each team member during the initial visit team meeting and assigns tasks accordingly. Additionally, the chair compiles questions and concerns raised during the pre-visit review of the Architecture Program Report (APR). Given the intensive accreditation schedule - traditionally four days and three nights, or three days and two nights under the revised schedule - the visit team must review a vast amount of documents and resources, conduct evaluations, and verify compliance within a limited timeframe. However, this timeframe is not sufficient for continuous deliberations or extended negotiations. Therefore, all visit team members, including the chair, must diligently complete their assigned tasks within the designated timeframe.

The visit team chair must ensure that task allocation allows for cross-checking and complementary reviews among all team members, preventing biased or subjective conclusions. Tasks may be distributed based on team members' experience levels, distinguishing between first-time reviewers and experienced evaluators. Observers (associate reviewers) may be actively utilized, but their level of participation is determined at the discretion of the visit team chair. Instead of assigning observers the same workload as full team members, they should be given a minimal but meaningful level of responsibility to gain practical experience for future accreditation visits and for preparing their own programs for accreditation. First-time visit team members and observers should seek guidance from experienced team members or KAAB staff during the accreditation visit to enhance their professional competence.

The details of task allocation must remain confidential. This is to prevent misunderstandings that may arise if a program assumes that a particular issue was identified solely due to the assigned reviewer. Even if the program becomes aware of the task distribution, it should not respond sensitively to this information. Task allocation is simply a means to maximize efficiency within a limited timeframe and workforce. All evaluation items are cross-reviewed, and final assessments are made through full team consensus. Thus, negative evaluations of specific criteria are not the opinion of an individual reviewer but the collective decision of the visit team. The program must fully understand this principle.

1.2.2 Procedure for Determining Evaluation Criteria

The evaluation of all items based on accreditation conditions cannot be determined

by an individual's unilateral assertions or opinions; rather, it must be decided through the consensus and agreement of the entire visit team. The visit team members present the issues and concerns discovered during their accreditation site visit tasks and share them for discussion. The visit team chair must ensure that the team members have opportunities for sufficient and free discussion to reach a consensus.

If there are differing opinions among the visit team members, each member must present objective and clear evidence to persuade and seek agreement from others. If opinions remain divided, the visit team chair acts as a mediator to facilitate the decision-making process, which may be determined by majority vote if necessary.

To ensure that the program can accept and recognize a fair and objective conclusion, the visit team must provide the program with ample opportunities for clarification and submission of materials during the accreditation site visit. This includes continuous opportunities for explanations through meetings with faculty and requests for additional materials as necessary.

Evaluating an item as "Requiring Improvement" or "Not Met" without allowing the program an opportunity for explanation constitutes a procedural error. However, failing to assess an item as "Requiring Improvement" or "Not Met" despite clear deficiencies also violates the responsibilities of the visit team. In cases where these two principles conflict, the visit team must prioritize the interests of students and guide the program toward qualitative improvement in education.

If, after the exit meeting with the program's faculty, the visit team identifies an item that requires improvement but was not given a chance for explanation, or if, just before the conclusion of the accreditation visit, the faculty asserts that a particular issue was not discussed, the following evaluation guidelines apply:

1. The visit team chair, despite time constraints, should seek the program director's understanding and implement procedures to allow additional inquiries and explanations, reflecting the findings in the visit team report (VTR).

2. If time constraints (e.g., late hours or the need for preparation of additional materials) prevent providing an opportunity for explanation, the visit team cannot assess the item as "Not Met." Instead, the item must be categorized as "Requiring Improvement" or recorded as a general comment, with the identified deficiency detailed in the VTR. In such cases, the visit team should clarify during the exit meeting that although the item was not fully reviewed with faculty, deficiencies were identified through interviews with external lecturers, enrolled students, or graduates, or through a review of student work.

3. If the program faculty acknowledges during the exit meeting that an opportunity for explanation was not provided for a particular issue, the visit team must verbally notify them that any item initially marked as "Not Met" will instead be categorized as "Requiring Improvement," and any "Requiring Improvement" item will be recorded as a general comment in the VTR. The visit team should also explain that although faculty did not have a direct opportunity for clarification, deficiencies were identified through interviews or student work reviews.

Additionally, if the visit team generally agrees on a determination of "Not Met" or "Requiring Improvement," the evaluation result must not be influenced by external factors unrelated to the review. For example, if an item has been marked as "Not Met" or "Requiring Improvement" for three consecutive accreditation cycles, as stipulated in "1.4. Accreditation Types (Terms) Review Guidelines" of the Accreditation Guidelines, the program must not modify its assessment to avoid exceeding the three-time limit. However, if the content requiring improvement has changed significantly from previous reviews, the item may be excluded from the count.

The program must actively engage in the accreditation review process during the site visit. Once the accreditation visit concludes, re-evaluation is no longer possible, and additional materials that were not presented during the site visit cannot be accepted. Since the program has the opportunity to clarify and present evidence during the site visit, the program may not appeal individual evaluation results after the accreditation visit.

1.2.3 Determination of Met, Not Met, and Requiring Improvement

Each evaluation item under the accreditation conditions is categorized as Met, Not Met, or Requiring Improvement. KAAB does not provide detailed criteria for distinguishing between Met and Not Met for each accreditation condition. This is because the visit team is composed entirely of experts (educators and architects), and their judgment relies entirely on reviewing the materials presented by the program and the discretion of the visit team members. However, since differences in judgment among members may arise and certain aspects might be overlooked, the final decision must be based on mutual discussion, consensus-building, or, if necessary, the majority rule. Therefore, the visit team must strictly adhere to the evaluation criteria determination procedure to ensure objectivity and fairness.

While some accreditation conditions can be evaluated relatively easily, most are complex and subject to interpretation. As a result, all evaluation items must be determined through sufficient discussion and agreement. To achieve this, the visit team must comprehensively consider the following aspects:

- Accurate understanding of what each accreditation condition signifies,

- Degree of alignment with the educational objectives and characteristics pursued by the university and program,

- Extent to which deficiencies negatively impact the qualitative level of education,

- Impact of these deficiencies on the educational attainment of students entering the profession, and

- Most importantly, the necessity for improvement to enhance the program's quality and development.

Regardless of how outstanding certain aspects of the program may be, deficiencies in other areas cannot be offset by excellence in different criteria. Each evaluation item must be assessed with equal weight.

For an evaluation item to be judged as Not Met, the visit team must thoroughly review the relevant materials, engage in sufficient discussion among team members, and provide the program with an adequate opportunity to explain. Once the accreditation site visit concludes, it is virtually impossible to reverse the evaluation result through reconsideration. Therefore, the visit team must exhaust all possible verification steps during the accreditation visit to ensure a high-quality review process.

The Requiring Improvement judgment falls under the Met category. However, it is assigned when maintaining the current level could have a negative impact on individual accreditation conditions or the overall quality of the educational program in the future. Additionally, this judgment applies when some aspects meet the standard while others do not, or when student work meets the criteria, but course syllabi and educational content cannot be verified. Notably, items under Performance Criteria 2.7.2 Criteria of Common Values are assessed as either Met or Requiring Improvement, without the possibility of a Not Met judgment.

Once the accreditation visit concludes, the program may request modifications or corrections only for factual inaccuracies in the visit team report (VTR). Since the program was provided opportunities for clarification and justification during the accreditation visit, any additional materials not presented during the visit cannot be accepted afterward. Therefore, the program must actively observe the thoroughness and prudence of the visit team's work, their review of relevant materials, adherence to the agenda, and the provision of opportunities for clarification during the accreditation process. The program must also submit an evaluation of the overall performance of the visit team to KAAB.

Regarding observers, their speaking rights are restricted during official sessions involving faculty members. They have no decision-making authority regarding compliance with evaluation criteria or any other official determinations made during the accreditation visit. However, if assigned a task by the visit team chair, observers may express their opinions to the chair and visit team members, which may be considered in the evaluation process. The visit team chair may, at their discretion, exclude observers from the final discussions on item evaluations.

Programs are expected to conduct self-assessments to identify and continuously improve operational deficiencies to ensure optimal compliance with accreditation conditions. During the site visit, the visit team may identify past deficiencies that have since been rectified. In such cases, the visit team must make a comprehensive judgment considering the duration of the deficiency and the effectiveness of the program's corrective actions and outcomes.

1.2.4 Guidelines for Writing Evaluation Comments

The visit team shall summarize its overall and comprehensive opinions on the program

in the "Team Comments" section of the Visiting Team Report (VTR). In the sections "Items of Well Met" and "Items of Not Met," the team shall explicitly state the names of the respective accreditation criteria without elaborating on their rationale. The detailed evaluation comments for the specified accreditation criteria should be thoroughly documented in the respective evaluation sections of the report. The team must base its documentation strictly on factual evidence.

The program must address the identified issues by presenting corrective measures and improvements in the Annual Report, which will be subject to reassessment during the next accreditation visit.

The evaluation sections should not contain recommendations or proposed solutions to the identified issues. It is the program's responsibility to develop solutions and improvements that align with its educational objectives and unique characteristics. If the visit team were to suggest specific solutions, such recommendations might be perceived as the official stance of KAAB, which could hinder the program's creative problem-solving capacity and limit its potential for growth. Additionally, such suggestions could impose undue pressure on the visit team during subsequent accreditation reviews.

Evaluation comments should be written clearly and concisely to ensure precise communication of their meaning. The use of ambiguous terms, complex sentences that may be difficult to interpret, or unnecessary details should be avoided as much as possible. Even for items evaluated as Met, the visit team may describe areas for improvement, which the program is then expected to address.

1.2.5 Guidelines for Evaluating Criteria of Common Values

The "Criteria of Common Values" in Section 2.7.2 are newly introduced standards aimed at establishing universal values that all professional architecture degree programs should pursue in training future architectural professionals. Each of these criteria represents an area where programs can develop their unique characteristics based on available resources and future development strategies. These criteria are broad and can be addressed through creative and innovative educational content and methodologies.

The program must define its educational methods and content for each criterion and present the corresponding learning outcomes through both curricular and extracurricular activities. Since a rigid application of evaluation standards could suppress educational innovation and specialization, the visit team should primarily provide guidance on the program's developmental direction without deviating significantly from the educational methods and content proposed by the program.

Evaluation results shall be classified as either Met or Requiring Improvement, with no classifications of Not Met. The evaluation process should reference Appendix 1: Evidence for Evaluating Criteria of Common Values.

1.2.6 Guidelines for Evaluating Student Performance Criteria (SPC)

1) Accreditation Criteria and Detailed Explanation

The 18 Student Performance Criteria (SPC) serve as the foundation for assessing a program's educational and learning outcomes. These criteria focus on developing students' architectural problem-solving skills and creative design abilities. The program must demonstrate that it ensures all students fulfill the SPC requirements through a unique and mandatory curriculum before graduation.

2) Reports and Exhibits for Evaluation

(1) Architecture Program Report (APR)

The program must document how it meets each evaluation criterion by linking it to its educational objectives. This includes describing the implementation of educational goals, the execution of detailed plans, and a self-assessment of compliance with each criterion.

(2) Course Information and Reference Materials

Programs must provide the following materials related to required and elective courses that contribute to achieving learning outcomes:

- Indication of relevant courses within the curriculum structure and their alignment with SPC.

- Course descriptions and syllabi.

- Lecture materials, textbooks, and reference documents.

- Field trip documents detailing students' learning objectives.

- Student performance records and grade distribution information.

(3) Student Work Samples

The student work samples must cover a period of one year, including the semester immediately preceding the accreditation site visit. These samples should be presented as physical samplings, divided into two levels: the highest level of achievement and the lowest level of achievement, with an appropriate number of works exhibited. The volume of exhibited work shall be determined at the program's discretion to ensure a comprehensive understanding of the overall educational program.

For past student work completed prior to the accreditation site visit, continuing accreditation programs must provide student work from the period following the last accreditation visit. For initial accreditation programs, at least three years' worth of student work must be provided in a separate storage medium, along with a computer for verification.

Evaluation Guidelines for Accreditation Criteria (Student Performance Criteria)

Evaluation Criteria	Conditions for Accreditation Part III. Learning Outcome (Student Performance Criteria)
Conditions for Accreditation	It aims to cultivate architectural problem-solving skills and creative design abilities, ensuring that students meet the 18 Student Performance Criteria (SPC), which encompass Critical Thinking in Architecture, Design, Engineering/Technology, and Practice as required in architectural practice. This is achieved through the program's unique mandatory curriculum.
Evaluation Elements	Whether the Architecture Program Report (APR) presents the overall educational objectives and methods for Student Performance Criteria (SPC) education, systematically outlining the curriculum operation methods and whether the course syllabi explicitly include SPC as predefined educational components. Whether the related education is conducted according to pre-established plans, whether student performance is evaluated based on learning outcomes, and whether a systematic management process is in place for tracking evaluation results and improving coursework. Whether the intended educational outcomes of the Student Performance Criteria (SPC) are sufficiently reflected in student work samples, as agreed upon by the majority of the accreditation site visit team members.

Evaluation Criteria	Conditions for Accreditation Part III. Learning Outcome (Student Performance Criteria)	
Evaluation Scale	Met	• The Architecture Program Report (APR) provides and reflects sufficient foundational information, and the course syllabi explicitly include SPC as predefined educational components. • Education is conducted according to pre-established plans, with performance-based evaluations, and a systematic management process is in place for course improvement. • The intended educational outcomes of the Student Performance Criteria (SPC) are appropriately reflected in student work samples, with the majority of the accreditation site visit team members agreeing on this assessment.
Evaluation Scale	Requiring Improvement	• When some aspects of the conditions composed of multiple evaluation elements are Not Met. • When there are some differences from the planned curriculum, and the regular management system for assessment based on learning outcomes and course improvement is Requiring Improvement. • When variations in achievement levels among individual students or between different design studio sections are identified. • When the educational intent and efforts are acknowledged, but the majority of the visit team determines that improvements are needed in the assessment of student learning outcome results.

Evaluation Scale	Not Met	• When only some aspects of the conditions composed of multiple evaluation elements are Met. • When significant discrepancies in achievement levels among individual students or between different design studio sections are observed. • When it is difficult to verify whether the curriculum has been delivered as planned, or when instructional materials and lecture resources cannot be confirmed. • When the same issues identified as Requiring Improvement in the previous accreditation review remain unaddressed. • When the majority of the visit team determines that the assessment of student learning outcome results is Not Met or insufficient.
	Others	• When there is no impact on the overall evaluation results, but some aspects are determined to require improvement.
Key Evaluation Focus and Considerations		• Educational outcomes through coursework must be achieved within the planned program structure; therefore, it must be evaluated whether the learning components are clearly presented in the course syllabus. • The assessment of student learning outcomes should be conducted based on a thorough understanding of the educational intent outlined in the Student Performance Criteria, as well as on the expertise of the evaluation team members and sufficient communication among them.

1.2.7 Guidelines for Evaluating Newly Introduced Educational Initiatives and Outcomes

Programs preparing for accreditation implement education that meets the Conditions for Accreditation through curriculum structure, individual courses, and inter-course integration. Furthermore, they strive to maintain a high level of educational quality through both internal and external evaluation systems. These efforts also include continuous adaptation to regularly updated Conditions for Accreditation, responsiveness to evolving societal demands, and differentiation and specialization from other programs by introducing new teaching methods and content.

These new attempts and efforts may lead to either positive or negative outcomes. However, if negative cases result in adverse effects that hinder further innovation and experimentation, this contradicts the objectives and principles pursued by the accreditation system. Such an outcome could lead to uniformity in education, ultimately restricting diversity and creativity in learning.

Negative results may stem from the visit team's rigid and uniform evaluation approach or may be temporary outcomes that arise during the program's implementation of new initiatives. However, the program's efforts and attempts to enhance the quality of education should be respected, and even shortcomings or temporary negative results in the process should also be acknowledged to encourage continuous improvement and further innovation.

Therefore, if the visit team assesses that the outcomes of newly implemented educational methods and content are somewhat negative, they should prioritize the

intent and expected benefits of these new initiatives rather than focusing solely on the results, following the guidelines below:

- The program's explanation of the necessity and expected outcomes of the newly introduced educational methods and content.

- Whether the program has established and implemented a self-assessment (feedback) system for the newly attempted educational methods, content, and outcomes.

- Whether the program evaluates its satisfaction with the expected outcomes through self-assessment and develops and implements continuous improvement plans.

1.3 Evaluation Guidelines for Conditions Related to Resources

In the KAAB 2010 Conditions & Procedures, quantitative criteria were partially presented for resource-related conditions, specifically "2.4 Research Development and Human Resources", and "2.5 Physical & Information Resources." However, since the KAAB 2013 Conditions & Procedures, the evaluation approach has shifted to a performance-based qualitative assessment, eliminating the previously required quantitative criteria related to pre-input resources.

As a result, this evaluation guideline has been developed to prevent potential difficulties and confusion for the visit team in assessing programs applying for initial accreditation or continuing accreditation without predefined quantitative criteria. Additionally, this guideline serves as a reference for programs preparing for accreditation.

The key evaluation principles that the visit team must follow for qualitative assessment of resource-related conditions are as follows:

- Each member of the visit team conducts an independent professional judgment as an expert in architectural education or practice, based on a review of the information presented in the APR and through on-site verification.

- To objectify subjective judgments, opinions from faculty meetings, enrolled students, and alumni interviews should be collected.

- The visit team consolidates individual opinions and collected feedback into a collective assessment and provides necessary recommendations to the program.

1) Condition 2.4 Research Development and Human Resources

The visit team qualitatively evaluates whether the program has an appropriate level of human resources and an administrative system necessary for successfully operating a professional degree program in architecture. This is assessed by reviewing student learning outcomes and identifying the causes of the results, based on the following aspects:

(1) For Continuing Accreditation Programs

- Whether the conditions of human resources have been maintained or improved compared to the previous accreditation review.

(2) For Initial Accreditation Programs

- Appropriateness of the teaching load for full-time faculty, considering both undergraduate and graduate courses.

- Whether each academic year has designated full-time faculty members responsible for coordination.

- Whether faculty roles, including participation in various committees and coordination tasks, are appropriately distributed to ensure efficient program operation.

- Adequacy of the number of full-time faculty available for individual student advising.

- Whether the design studio is conducted through individualized instruction.

- Whether each student receives a minimum of 40 minutes per week of individual guidance in design studio courses.

- Whether the allocated class hours per credit for design studio courses are sufficient for effective individual instruction.

- Whether the administrative staff provides adequate support for faculty in handling administrative tasks.

2) Condition 2.5 Physical & Information Resources

The visit team qualitatively evaluates whether the program has an appropriate level of physical resources necessary for successfully operating a professional degree program in architecture. This is assessed by reviewing student learning outcomes and identifying the causes of the results, based on the following criteria:

(1) For Continuing Accreditation Programs

- Whether the conditions of physical and information resources have been maintained or improved compared to the previous accreditation review.

(2) For Initial Accreditation Programs

- Whether the design studio is divided into small studios that operate independently.

- If small studio divisions are not implemented, whether any issues arise in studio operations.

- Whether students have designated individual workspaces for both design studio classes and personal design work in the same space.

- Whether students can access the design studio at all times for creative and effective

individual design work.

- Whether proper safety equipment, safety management systems, and personnel are in place for model-making facilities.

- Whether student feedback on physical resources is regularly collected and reflected in facility improvements.

- The visit team also qualitatively evaluates whether the program has an appropriate level of Physical & information resources necessary for successfully operating a professional degree program in architecture. This is assessed based on the following criteria:

(3) For Continuing Accreditation Programs

- Whether the conditions of Physical & information resources have been maintained or improved compared to the previous accreditation review.

(4) For Initial Accreditation Programs

- Whether library accessibility is appropriate for students.

- Whether the library has a sufficient collection of architecture-related books (minimum of 5,000 distinct architecture-specific volumes, each with a unique classification number).

- Whether students have easy access to alternative information resources beyond the central library.

- Whether students have sufficient access to the latest information on domestic and international architectural trends, including architecture journals and periodicals.

- Whether student requests for additional books and materials are appropriately addressed.

3) Provision of Resource-Related Information for Human, Physical, and Information Resources

To align with the outcome-based evaluation approach of the accreditation system and to reduce the burden on programs, the previously required quantitative criteria for human resources, physical resources, and information resources have been removed and replaced with qualitative criteria. However, programs applying for initial accreditation or undergoing restructuring may face difficulties in independently determining and preparing an appropriate level of resources necessary for successfully operating a professional degree program in architecture.

Therefore, access to relevant information is essential to help programs establish an adequate resource level. To support this, KAAB provides statistical data on resources from already accredited programs - either with or without program identification - through its official website. Programs should utilize this information as a reference to successfully prepare for accreditation. Additionally, they should refer to 1.3 Evaluation Guidelines for Conditions Related to Resources for further guidance.

1.4 Evaluation Guidelines for Types (Terms) of Accreditation

The Visit Team conducts an on-site evaluation of the architecture program applying for accreditation and, based on the findings, submits a Confidential Recommendation to KAAB regarding the term of accreditation. The evaluation process encourages a qualitative approach centered on student work, and it must be recognized that resource-related factors should not serve as absolute criteria for assessment.

The types of accreditation are categorized based on the term of accreditation, which signifies the validity period. The term guarantees that students who obtain a professional degree and graduate within the accreditation period have received an appropriate education. Additionally, the term reflects the urgency with which the architecture program must address critical deficiencies identified during the accreditation review.

The review guidelines for determining the type of accreditation are established to ensure a minimum level of consistency and fairness in the evaluation outcomes across different Visit Teams. While these guidelines are not mandatory, they serve as a reference for determining the type of accreditation. Since various scenarios may arise beyond those outlined in the guidelines, the Visit Team should conduct a holistic qualitative assessment of the overall educational quality of the program and make an accreditation decision accordingly. Therefore, programs cannot file an appeal based solely on these guidelines.

The critical deficiencies mentioned in KAAB 2024 Conditions & Procedures, Section 4.4.6 Accreditation Decision, (2) Types and Duration of Accreditation, are defined as follows:

1) Four-year (Three-year for Initial Accreditation) Accreditation may be granted if any of the following deficiencies are present:

(1) A specific evaluation item has been cited as Not Met or Requiring Improvement for three consecutive accreditation reviews.

(2) Six or more items within the 2.7 Performance Criteria (out of 18 subcategories) are rated as Not Met.

(3) Three or more items among the seven accreditation criteria (2.1 – 2.7) are rated as Not Met, including at least one of the following:

> 2.1 KAAB Perspectives on Architectural Education (if at least one of the four subcategories is rated as Not Met, the entire section is considered Not Met).

> 2.2 Educational Objectives of the Architecture Program and Curriculum.

> 2.3 Student Information.

> 2.4 Research Development and Human Resources.

> 2.5 Physical & Information Resources.

> 2.6 Financial Resources.

2.7 Performance Criteria *(if five or more of the 18 subcategories are rated as Not Met, this section is considered Not Met).*

2) Conditional Three-year (Two-year for Initial Accreditation) Accreditation may be granted if any of the following deficiencies are present:

(1) A specific evaluation item has been cited as Not Met or Requiring Improvement for four consecutive accreditation reviews.

(2) Seven or more items within the 2.7 Performance Criteria (out of 18 subcategories) are rated as Not Met.

(3) Three or more items among the seven accreditation criteria (2.1 – 2.7) are rated as Not Met, including both:

- 2.2 Educational Objectives of the Architectural Program and Curriculum.
- 2.7 Performance Criteria.

1.5 On-Site Response Guidelines for an Effective Accreditation Visit (On-Site Response Manual)

The accreditation visit relies on cooperation between the Visit Team and the program's faculty, ensuring mutual collaboration while maintaining the rigor of the evaluation process. The visit must follow the pre-agreed agenda and procedures. However, unexpected situations may arise that could affect the smooth progress of the accreditation visit. The Visit Team Chair and members must be well-versed in the following response guidelines.

1.5.1 Guidelines for Handling Unexpected Situations Due to Disagreements During the Visit

The accreditation review operates on a peer-review process, emphasizing horizontal communication rather than a hierarchical relationship between the Visit Team and the architecture program. The program is expected to accept the evaluation results unless there is a significant procedural error. However, situations may arise where actions or statements by either the Visit Team or program faculty lead to misunderstandings, potentially impacting the accreditation visit. To prevent such occurrences, the following measures must be taken:

- The Visit Team should refrain from making definitive statements such as "insufficient" or "inadequate" during the visit. Instead, they should use forward-looking expressions like, "We will consider this aspect in the evaluation," or "We will review this matter again."

- Program faculty should respect the Visit Team's evaluation process. If they have any doubts, they should promptly ask questions to avoid misunderstandings and immediately clarify any uncertainties.

- If necessary, KAAB representatives accompanying the visit can be utilized to verify and relay concerns or questions between the Visit Team and the program.

Despite these precautions, significant disruptions may arise between the Visit Team and program representatives, or with other involved parties. In such cases, the following guidelines must be followed:

- If a hostile situation (such as verbal abuse or confrontational behavior) arises, making it difficult to maintain cooperative conditions, the Visit Team Chair may temporarily suspend the accreditation visit upon the recommendation of the program, a Visit Team member, or a KAAB representative.

- If the visit is temporarily halted, the Visit Team Chair, in the presence of a KAAB staff member, may engage with the involved parties individually to determine the root cause and propose resolutions. If the issue is resolved, the accreditation visit resumes.

- If the problem cannot be resolved:

1. If the temporary suspension of the accreditation site visit is determined to have resulted from an issue caused by the architecture program, the Visit Team Chair may make a final decision to officially notify the program representative and the university's chief administrative officer (or their delegate) of the planned early termination of the accreditation site visit. In such cases, the university or program leadership must be given an opportunity to present a rebuttal or take corrective action. The university must utilize this opportunity within the same business day, but it also retains the option not to respond. The Visit Team Chair may proceed with early termination if deemed necessary.

2. If the temporary suspension of the accreditation site visit results from misconduct or actions of a Visit Team member, leading to their removal from the team or an equivalent disciplinary measure, the Visit Team Chair must hold discussions with the program leadership and academic administration to determine whether the accreditation site visit should continue. The continuation of the visit requires mutual agreement with the university, and the Visit Team Chair retains the authority to terminate the visit early if deemed necessary.

3. As a follow-up measure, the Visit Team Chair must convene a meeting with the program leadership and academic administration to either formally withdraw the early termination notice and continue the accreditation site visit, or, if early termination is confirmed, provide the program with information on KAAB's policies regarding available options. (Refer to KAAB Conditions & Procedures, Section 4.3.7.)

4. If the early termination of the accreditation site visit is confirmed, the Visit Team must promptly clear the team room, vacate the premises, and disband immediately.

1.5.2 Guidelines for Responding to Natural Disasters and Emergencies

In the event of unforeseen circumstances such as natural disasters, fires, or accidents involving the Visit Team, making it impossible to continue the accreditation visit, the following steps should be taken:

The Visit Team Chair must immediately suspend the visit and consult with KAAB staff and program representatives to decide whether the visit can proceed.

The visit can only continue if all risks have been mitigated and safety is ensured. If safety remains a concern, the Visit Team Chair may decide to terminate the visit early.

If the visit is terminated, KAAB will provide the program with options regarding the next steps, in accordance with KAAB Conditions & Procedures, Section 4.3.7.

Upon termination, the Visit Team must promptly vacate the site and disband.

1.6 Site Visit Protocols for the Visit Team

The accreditation site visit is a highly sensitive process. The Visit Team must strictly adhere to the prescribed accreditation site visit protocols, as any failure to comply may be deemed a procedural error by the architecture program. Furthermore, violations of these protocols may undermine the purpose and intent of the KAAB accreditation site visit. Any such violations may also be reflected in the Evaluation of Visit Team Work conducted by the program.

If an issue arises due to a violation of the accreditation site visit protocols by a Visit Team member, the Visit Team Chair must convene a meeting with the rest of the Visit Team, excluding the member in question, to discuss the necessary reporting to KAAB and the appropriate follow-up actions. Before the accreditation site visit, the Visit Team Chair must provide a thorough orientation to all members, emphasizing the importance of these protocols.

1) The Visit Team Members Must Review and Follow the Accreditation Review Guidelines

To ensure the proper execution of the accreditation site visit, the Visit Team must review and strictly follow the contents of the Accreditation Review Guidelines.

2) Confidential Information Must Not Be Disclosed

All information obtained by Visit Team members during the review of the Architecture Program Report (APR) and the accreditation site visit must be treated as confidential. Disclosing any information to external parties beyond the applying program or KAAB constitutes a breach of professional duty.

3) The Distribution of Review Assignments Among Visit Team Members Must Remain Confidential

Disclosing the internal division of evaluation tasks among Visit Team members during the accreditation site visit may lead to excessive responses from the program, potentially undermining the purpose of the visit. Furthermore, confidentiality must be maintained even after the accreditation site visit has concluded.

Particularly, observers recommended by the program must refrain from contacting program representatives during the visit to maintain the objectivity and transparency of the accreditation review.

Evaluation assignments are structured to allow for overlapping reviews among Visit Team members, and the final assessment is a collective decision rather than an individual determination. Therefore, individual Visit Team members must avoid presenting themselves as solely responsible for specific judgments.

4) Authoritative or Unilateral Conduct is Prohibited During the Accreditation Site Visit

The KAAB accreditation site visit is conducted through collaborative engagement rather than a one-sided evaluation. For a successful visit, the architecture program must be given sufficient opportunities to present its perspectives. Each Visit Team member must refrain from exercising authority in a manner that could be perceived as domineering. Instead, they must actively engage in communication and dialogue with the program. Since the program evaluates the Visit Team's performance, team members must remain mindful of their conduct.

5) Personal Actions That Disrupt Accreditation Site Visit Tasks are Prohibited

Each Visit Team member represents KAAB and must avoid any personal actions or behaviors that may disrupt the overall process. All scheduled items must be adhered to strictly, and unauthorized absences or unexpected actions during the accreditation site visit are strictly prohibited.

6) The Visit Team Must Not Suggest Remedies for Deficiencies

Regardless of how minor a deficiency may seem, the Visit Team must not provide specific solutions to the architecture program. If the Visit Team offers concrete recommendations, they may be misinterpreted as official KAAB guidance, potentially hindering the program's autonomy and innovation. Furthermore, such guidance could undermine future Visit Teams' ability to conduct more progressive evaluations.

7) Overreacting to or Overlooking Deficiencies is Prohibited

The accreditation site visit is designed to assess whether the architecture program can

identify and address deficiencies within its structural framework. Visit Team members must remain neutral, avoiding both overly critical attitudes that may be perceived as punitive and overly optimistic attitudes that downplay deficiencies.

8) Evaluations Must Not Be Influenced by the Program's Prestige

Deficiencies identified in highly prestigious programs must be assessed with the same objectivity and rigor as those found in other programs. The Visit Team must not overlook or downplay deficiencies based on the program's reputation or status.

9) The Use of Mobile Phones is Prohibited

During the accreditation site visit, Visit Team members must keep their mobile phones turned off, not just on silent mode. If necessary, designated break periods may be arranged, during which phone usage is permitted with the Visit Team Chair's approval. The use of mobile phones during working sessions may undermine the seriousness and professionalism of the KAAB accreditation process.

10) Photography During Accreditation Site Visit Tasks is Prohibited

All Visit Team members, including observers, are strictly prohibited from taking photographs of the architecture program during the accreditation site visit. Unauthorized photography may cause discomfort for the program and raise concerns about the exposure of sensitive materials. However, limited photography may be permitted within pre-approved parameters, subject to the Visit Team Chair's discretion.

11) Requests for Personal Accommodations from the Program are Prohibited

During the accreditation site visit, Visit Team members must not request any personal accommodations unrelated to the official KAAB accreditation review process.

12) Job-Seeking or Recruitment Activities During the Accreditation Site Visit are Prohibited

Until the accreditation decision is finalized, Visit Team members must not express interest in employment at the architecture program or engage in recruitment activities on behalf of their own institutions.

13) Receiving Gifts or Hospitality from the Program is Prohibited

During the accreditation site visit, Visit Team members must not accept any gifts, entertainment, meals, or services from the architecture program. All expenses for the Visit Team, including meals, are covered by KAAB.

14) Receiving Accommodations from the Program After the Accreditation Site Visit is Prohibited

Once the accreditation site visit concludes, the architecture program must not offer, and the Visit Team must not accept, any additional accommodations. This includes transportation, meals, or any other form of hospitality. Moreover, maintaining inappropriate post-visit contact with the program should be strictly avoided.

15) Cooperating with the Visit Team Chair and Upholding Team Integrity

The Visit Team Chair plays a crucial role in leading the accreditation site visit, leveraging extensive experience in KAAB accreditation. Therefore, all Visit Team members must actively support the Chair's leadership and prioritize the interests of the Visit Team over individual concerns. Even after the accreditation site visit is completed, Visit Team members must ensure that they do not damage the reputation of the team or compromise the integrity of the accreditation process.

1.7 Accreditation Consultation

1) Continuing Accreditation Programs

KAAB provides accreditation consultation for architecture programs that receive an accreditation term other than six years (e.g., four years) as a result of a continuing accreditation review. Programs must submit a formal request for accreditation consultation via email within one year from the date they receive notification of their accreditation review results.

- KAAB recommends that accreditation consultation be conducted as soon as possible (within a maximum of one year) after the program is notified of its accreditation review results. This ensures a prompt resolution of areas requiring improvement and minimizes reliance on memory.

- Programs must submit their consultation request to KAAB via email or phone. Upon receiving the request, KAAB appoints the Visit Team Chair or an additional Visit Team member as a consultant and coordinates a site visit with the program. If necessary, the Visit Team Chair may request the participation of a KAAB staff member.

- Accreditation consultation is conducted in a question-and-answer format, focusing on the evaluation comments in the Visit Team Report (VTR) related to areas requiring improvement.

- If needed, programs may use the materials exhibited during the accreditation site visit as reference for consultation. Typically, accreditation consultation lasts two to three hours.

- Consultation is limited to one session, and all associated costs (travel expenses,

consultant fees, etc.) are covered by KAAB. The program is responsible for providing the necessary materials and venue for the consultation.

- If a program does not request accreditation consultation within one year, it is considered to have forfeited its right to consultation.

2) Initial Accreditation Programs

KAAB provides accreditation consultation for programs preparing to apply for initial accreditation after establishing an architecture program.

- A program planning to establish an architecture program with the goal of obtaining KAAB accreditation must request accreditation consultation (via phone or email) before the program is officially launched. The consultation will focus on the curriculum and overall resources required for accreditation.

- A second accreditation consultation is available after the application for candidacy status and candidacy review. This consultation will address the candidacy review results, challenges encountered after the program's launch, and preparations for the accreditation site visit.

- Programs must submit their consultation request within one year from the date they receive notification of their accreditation review results.

- If a program does not request accreditation consultation within one year, it is considered to have forfeited its right to consultation. All costs associated with the accreditation consultation (travel expenses, consultant fees, etc.) are covered by KAAB, while the program is responsible for providing the necessary materials and venue.

A program seeking initial accreditation must obtain accreditation before the graduation of its first cohort of students to ensure that they graduate with an accredited degree. To achieve this, the accreditation review must be conducted before the program is fully completed, specifically during the final semester of the first graduating class. Due to this requirement, initial accreditation is uniformly granted a three-year term. To facilitate a successful accreditation process, the program should seek accreditation consultation before the accreditation site visit and, after accreditation, implement optimal corrective measures for identified deficiencies. This process ensures the stable maintenance of accreditation.

2. Guidelines for Academic Administration and Management of the Architecture Program

2.1 Core Competencies and Performance Criteria Matrix

KAAB has established the core competencies of architectural education based on the OBJECTIVES OF ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION outlined in the UNESCO-UIA CHARTER FOR ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION – 2023 Revision of the 2021 Edition. To align with these objectives, KAAB has formulated Performance Criteria, which includes both Criteria of Common Values and Student Performance Criteria. These relationships are presented in a Core Competencies and Performance Criteria Matrix (refer to KAAB 2024 Conditions & Procedures, p.18).

The Core Competencies and Performance Criteria Matrix serves as documented evidence that KAAB's Performance Criteria comprehensively address the educational objectives outlined in the UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education. This matrix is not an additional requirement for programs preparing for accreditation.

2.2 Dual Enrollment and Prerequisite Course Structures for Design Studios

Design education is at the core of professional degree programs in architecture, integrating a diverse range of theoretical knowledge and technical skills. It is characterized by a structured progression, ensuring the sequential expansion of knowledge over the designated academic period.

To facilitate systematic design education, programs must organize design studio courses according to appropriate levels for each academic year (or semester). As a general principle, programs must prohibit students from enrolling in multiple design studios within the same semester and implement a prerequisite system that enforces sequential coursework.

However, exceptions may be granted in cases where simultaneous dual enrollment in multiple design studios within the same semester or deviation from the sequential coursework structure is deemed necessary due to unavoidable circumstances, such as:

Irregular re-enrollment,

Failure to earn required credits,

Transferring-in students from outside or within the university resulting in a shortage of design credits.

In such cases, the program must ensure that the quality of education is maintained by documenting advising and oversight records for the affected students. These records, along with the students' academic work, must be presented to the Visit Team during the accreditation site visit for evaluation.

2.3 Operation of Design Studios During Seasonal Semesters

When offering design studios or other architecture courses during summer or winter sessions, programs must ensure that the curriculum meets the same standards as the regular academic term. If a program operates a joint studio or credit transfer system in collaboration with other institutions due to difficulties in course availability, it is recommended that students enroll in design courses offered by an accredited program. Additionally, the program must provide documented evidence that students meet the Student Performance Criteria (SPC) requirements.

2.4 Academic Management System

KAAB accreditation is granted at the program level. Consequently, all enrolled students, including transferring-in students from outside or within the university, must complete the required curriculum and meet all Student Performance Criteria upon graduation. Failure to ensure this may result in negative accreditation outcomes.

If a program allows students to meet Student Performance Criteria through elective courses, it must maintain a detailed matrix tracking the correlation between completed coursework and Student Performance Criteria for each student. This matrix must demonstrate that all students fulfill the Student Performance Criteria before graduation.

When transitioning a course from elective to required status, students who initially followed the elective-based curriculum must also be individually assessed to confirm that they meet all Student Performance Criteria. Similarly, if courses are transitioned from required to elective, or if courses are discontinued or newly introduced, the program must establish substitute courses or implement content adjustments to ensure that students still fulfill all Student Performance Criteria.

Particular attention must be given to transferring-in students from outside or within the university regarding the recognition of credits earned at their previous institutions or programs. The program must provide documented evidence that the course content and earned hours of transferred credits align with those of the program's own curriculum. Furthermore, the program must maintain a clearly defined academic management system for these students and provide a comprehensive explanation of how it is implemented.

2.5 Guidelines for Managing Multiple Degree Programs

1) Undergraduate Admissions Structure

When an architecture program operates multiple degree tracks - such as a four-year program and a five-year professional degree program - under a common undergraduate admission process, students may be required to select a specific track when advancing to the second, third, or fourth year. Additionally, some programs allow transfers between tracks, such as moving from the four-year track to the five-year track or vice versa. However, transfers are not permitted at the fifth-year level.

In such cases, the multiple degree tracks must be operated according to institutionally pre-defined criteria, which may classify them as departments, tracks, majors, or educational programs. The degree title of the five-year professional degree in architecture must be clearly distinguished from that of other degree tracks.

All transfers and changes in major or program enrollment must go through an official process, and records of such transitions must be maintained. The KAAB accreditation review applies exclusively to students enrolled in the five-year professional degree program. Students who transfer to and graduate from a four-year degree program, such as a Bachelor of Science in Architectural Engineering, are not subject to KAAB accreditation review. However, prior to track separation, the shared curriculum must be managed as an integral part of the five-year professional degree program.

2) Separate Admissions for Multiple Degree Tracks

When an institution offers distinct degree tracks - such as a four-year program (e.g., Architectural Engineering) and a five-year professional degree program (Bachelor of Architecture) - and admits students separately by department, major, or program, all transfers between tracks must be conducted in accordance with the institution's academic regulations.

The KAAB accreditation review applies exclusively to students enrolled in the five-year professional degree program, excluding those who transfer out to a four-year program. However, students who transfer into the five-year professional degree program from a four-year program through an official process are subject to accreditation. Such students must demonstrate that they have completed the equivalent coursework and graduation requirements of the five-year professional degree program.

Any transfers between the five-year and four-year programs must follow an official academic transfer process, and records of such transitions must be maintained.

3) Operation of a Four-Year General Degree Track within a Five-Year Professional Degree Program

If a four-year general degree track is operated within a five-year professional degree program, it must comply with the institution's pre-established internal criteria (such as academic regulations). Furthermore, any separation or transfer between the KAAB-

accredited five-year degree program and the non-accredited four-year degree program must be conducted through an official academic process, and records must be maintained.

The academic performance and graduation outcomes of students who transfer to and graduate from a four-year degree track are not subject to KAAB accreditation review. The accreditation applies exclusively to students enrolled in the five-year professional degree program. However, before the separation of tracks, the shared curriculum must be managed as an integral part of the five-year professional degree program.

The degree titles for each track may be distinguished as follows:

Korean title: 건축학사 (4년제 일반과정) / English title: Bachelor of Architectural Studies

Korean title: 건축학사 (5년제 전문과정) / English title: Bachelor of Architecture (B.Arch)

4) Integrated Five-Year Professional Degree and Graduate Program

When a five-year professional degree program is integrated with a graduate program (e.g., a 4.5-year undergraduate + 1.5-year graduate program), the program must operate in accordance with pre-established internal criteria (such as academic regulations), and records of student enrollment and progress must be maintained.

The academic regulations must explicitly state that students in the integrated program are required to complete coursework equivalent to the fifth-year, second-semester curriculum of the undergraduate program while enrolled in the graduate program. Failure to enforce this requirement may result in accreditation revocation or other penalties.

2.6 Guidelines for the Operation of Open Major Programs

1) General Principles

Professional degree programs are designed to train licensed professionals whose expertise directly impacts public health, safety, and welfare. Fields such as medicine, law, architecture, and pharmacy fall under this category, as they require not only specialized knowledge and technical skills but also a strong emphasis on social responsibility, public interest, professional ethics, and regulatory compliance.

Due to the rigorous qualification requirements and responsibilities associated with professional licensure, national governments oversee and regulate these professions. One of the key measures for maintaining high educational standards in professional degree programs is the requirement that candidates for licensure must graduate from an accredited degree program. This approach ensures the quality of professional education, facilitates the production of highly qualified professionals, and maintains equity among related licensure systems.

The Korea Architectural Accrediting Board (KAAB) is the only architecture education

accrediting body in South Korea, officially designated by the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure, and Transport (MOLIT). KAAB operates under the Architect Act, conducting accreditation reviews and granting accreditation to architecture programs based on established conditions and procedures. Additionally, KAAB is recognized under the National Higher Education Act (Article 11-2, Paragraphs 2 and 3) as an authorized academic accreditation body, playing a pivotal role in fostering architectural design professionals in South Korea. Furthermore, KAAB is a full signatory of the Canberra Accord, an international agreement that ensures the mutual recognition of accredited architecture degrees among signatory member countries. This affiliation not only facilitates the implementation of high-quality professional education required for architect licensure but also enhances the global recognition and competitiveness of South Korean architecture graduates.

Given these factors, the KAAB accreditation system and accredited architecture degree programs play a critical role in ensuring international educational standards, strengthening national competitiveness, and training qualified professionals in architectural design. Additionally, since KAAB-accredited architecture programs are directly linked to national licensure systems, they should be exempt from the introduction of open major (or undeclared major) systems, similar to other regulated fields such as medicine and healthcare.

2) Open Major (or Undeclared Major) System and Accredited Architecture Programs

Nevertheless, if an accredited architecture program introduces an open major (or undeclared major) system, it must maintain high-quality educational environments (including human and physical resources) and uphold excellence in architectural education in compliance with KAAB accreditation conditions and procedures. These procedures align with the Architect Act, Higher Education Act, UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education, and Canberra Accord, all of which regulate the training of architectural design professionals.

Failure to meet these standards may result in negative accreditation outcomes during the next accreditation review. To prevent such issues, the program must follow the guidelines below and report compliance through its Annual Report:

- If students from an open major (or undeclared major program) are awarded a KAAB-accredited degree, the program must implement a rigorous academic management system similar to that applied to transfer and major-change students. The program must establish clear academic regulations regarding the completion of required courses, including core architecture courses.

- If an open major (or undeclared major) student has not completed foundation design courses offered at the first-year level, they may be allowed to enroll in second-year design studio courses concurrently. However, the program must closely monitor and evaluate potential issues arising from overlapping design coursework and implement internal assessments and improvement measures to maintain educational quality.

- The program must ensure that the increased enrollment of open major (or undeclared major) students does not result in insufficient individual workspaces. The institution

must establish support measures to accommodate physical resource requirements.

- To prevent a reduction in individual guidance time and an excessive increase in faculty workload due to higher student numbers in design studios, the institution must provide additional sections and faculty reinforcements as necessary.

3. Considerations for Preparing the Accreditation Site Visit

The following are additional considerations for architecture programs preparing for the Accreditation Site Visit, in conjunction with Section 4.3.6, "Responsibility of the Program for the Site Visit" in the KAAB Conditions & Procedures.

3.1 Site Visit Team Room

The Visit Team Chair must inspect the Visit Team Room before the Accreditation Site Visit begins to verify whether the essential materials required for the visit (refer to Section 4.3.6 of the KAAB Conditions & Procedures) are already in place or will be prepared. If an on-site inspection is not feasible before the Accreditation Site Visit, the Visit Team Chair must consult with the program administrator via phone and ensure that a physical inspection is conducted at least one week before the visit or, at the latest, on the preceding Saturday. If the Visit Team Chair determines that the Visit Team Room is inadequately prepared, they must specify the necessary improvements, set a deadline for completion, and instruct the program administrator to implement the required adjustments.

- The Visit Team Room must ensure security and confidentiality, allowing the Visit Team to freely review student work, materials, and documents provided by the program. The space should have appropriate soundproofing and ventilation. The Visit Team Chair must confirm these conditions with the program in advance.

- The entrance to the Visit Team Room must have a secure locking mechanism and should only be accessible to the Visit Team or KAAB-assigned personnel throughout the Accreditation Site Visit. To enhance security, a digital door lock with a changeable code (or a similar locking mechanism) is recommended instead of traditional keys that can be duplicated.

- Any personnel responsible for cleaning, replenishing supplies, or providing additional requested materials must be strictly controlled under the supervision of the Visit Team Chair. If such measures are not properly implemented, the Visit Team Chair must issue a formal warning to the program administrator. Depending on the severity of the issue, the Visit Team may collectively decide on an early termination of the Accreditation Site Visit.

- Student work must be displayed in a way that allows for easy review. Representative samples of the highest-achieving and minimum-achieving student work must be provided. The display may primarily focus on the highest-achieving work, while minimum-achieving work can be stored in an easily accessible location within the Visit Team Room.

- Separating the team meeting space from the student work display area is prohibited.

This ensures that all discussions, evaluations, and documentation by the Visit Team remain directly connected to the review of student work. Additionally, this policy encourages programs to adopt a sustainable approach to Accreditation Site Visit preparation, preventing excessive use of spatial resources. However, if space constraints make it unavoidable, non-essential materials such as elective course materials or faculty work samples may be displayed separately to create room for the Visit Team's meeting area. Such arrangements must be pre-approved by the Visit Team Chair.

- Overcrowding the Visit Team Room with an excessive amount of student work in a large, inefficient space can reduce the effectiveness of the Visit Team's review process and place an unnecessary burden on the overall Accreditation Site Visit. Programs should take this into careful consideration.

3.2 Student Work Exhibition

The display method, scope, and quantity of student work in the Visit Team Room, which constitutes a significant portion of the Accreditation Site Visit, should be determined creatively, considering the unique characteristics of the program. Faculty members must thoroughly prepare their materials, divide responsibilities effectively, and be capable of sufficiently addressing the Visit Team's inquiries through well-documented evidence and direct explanations.

- Student work must be displayed exclusively within the Visit Team Room. This is to ensure that highest-achieving and minimum-achieving work samples are clearly distinguished while safeguarding student privacy, as the Visit Team Room is a controlled-access space. Additionally, the Visit Team must conduct continuous closed-door discussions and reviews based on the displayed materials throughout the Accreditation Site Visit.

- Student work displayed in the Visit Team Room must include the students' names. However, if the work is to be publicly exhibited after the Accreditation Site Visit, names must be obscured or removed to protect student privacy.

- The program may choose to celebrate the completion of the Accreditation Site Visit by hosting a public exhibition of student work immediately after the visit.

- Design studio courses often operate with multiple sections based on the number of student enrollment, with some sections sharing the same design theme while others differ. When determining the number of works to be displayed, the program must consider the available space. Excessive displays may burden the program's preparation, while too few may result in insufficient evaluation materials, making it challenging for the Visit Team to conduct a thorough review.

- As a general guideline, for studios operating with 1–2 sections, at least 2–3 projects per section should be displayed. For studios with 3–4 sections, at least 1–2 projects per section should be displayed. For studios with 5 or more sections, at least 1 project per section should be displayed.

- Highest-achieving student work should be displayed on vertical walls, while other student work (e.g., individual portfolios) should be placed at a lower level or nearby for easy access. Labels should be used to indicate achievement levels (e.g., evaluation grades) clearly.

- It is highly recommended to include not only the final presentation panels but also intermediate design process materials to provide insight into the development of student projects.

- While creative display methods tailored to the program's characteristics are encouraged, the arrangement should also accommodate the Visit Team's needs. Therefore, it is recommended that the program consult with the Visit Team Chair in advance regarding the display method, scope, and quantity of student work.

3.3 Guidelines for Retaining and Evaluating Past Student Work

The Accreditation Review is conducted based on student work from the two academic terms preceding the review term. For example, if the Accreditation Site Visit takes place in the Fall 2019 semester, student work from the Fall 2018 and Spring 2019 semesters must be fully displayed for evaluation. Additionally, student work produced since the previous Accreditation Review must be made accessible for the Visit Team's reference, in accordance with Section 4.3.6, "Responsibility of the Program for the Site Visit," (3) Student Work in the KAAB Conditions & Procedures.

The purpose of reviewing past student work is not to reassess all student work produced since the last Accreditation Review, but rather to verify whether the program has maintained consistency or made changes in its educational approach. Given the time constraints during the Accreditation Site Visit, it is physically impossible to evaluate all past student work.

- For lecture courses, a minimum of 3–4 samples of exams and reports must be retained to verify the assessment content. For design studio courses, a meaningful number of final projects (at least 50% of enrolled students per term) must be archived digitally by year, semester, and course using appropriate storage media.

- If the Visit Team identifies concerning deficiencies in the student work displayed during the Accreditation Site Visit, but the program claims that these issues resulted from unavoidable circumstances (e.g., faculty turnover or vacancies), the Visit Team may review past student work to assess whether such circumstances justify the inconsistencies.

In cases where the program is unable to provide any past student work due to damaged or lost storage media, the program must take the following preemptive actions:

- If storage media is damaged, the program must attempt data recovery.

- If storage media is lost, the program must issue an emergency notice to students before the Accreditation Site Visit to collect available materials.

- The program must notify the KAAB Office and the Visit Team in advance.

If the program ultimately fails to present any past student work during the Accreditation Site Visit, the Visit Team must take the following steps:

- Verify whether the program attempted data recovery or material recollection.

- If necessary, conduct interviews with representative students from each academic year to assess educational consistency.

- Document the issue in the Visit Team Report (VTR).

Failure to provide past student work at the time of the Accreditation Site Visit constitutes non-compliance with accreditation documentation requirements, and any disadvantages resulting from this will be the program's responsibility. As a follow-up measure, KAAB will monitor the program's compliance with student work archiving requirements through its Annual Report process.

3.4 Qualifications of the Accreditation Program Directors (PD) etc.

The Accreditation Site Visit, which involves an on-site evaluation, is the most critical and substantial phase of the Accreditation Review Process. The scope and volume of materials that a program must prepare for the Accreditation Site Visit are extensive. Although the Visit Team consists of professionals engaged in both academia and practice, the scheduled Accreditation Site Visit is insufficient for reviewing the extensive materials prepared by the program, addressing all site visit agenda items, and reaching consensus through continuous discussions. Therefore, close and effective communication between the key personnel leading the Accreditation Site Visit preparation and the Visit Team is essential.

The Accreditation Program Director (Accreditation PD) or any faculty member representing the program during the Accreditation Site Visit must possess a high level of understanding of the accreditation system's objectives, intent, and detailed conditions for accreditation. They must be able to provide accurate and prompt responses to the Visit Team's inquiries and deliver supporting documents as required.

To ensure the Visit Team can effectively conduct the Accreditation Site Visit, it is recommended that faculty members responsible for leading accreditation preparation and representing the program during the visit meet the following qualifications:

- At least five years of experience as a faculty member in the program since their initial appointment.

※ Note: The five-year teaching experience requirement may include prior experience at another institution with an accredited program.

- Participation in at least two Accreditation Site Visits at other institutions as an observer or Visit Team member.

※ Note: Faculty members with at least two experiences as an observer or Visit Team member may be eligible even if they have less than five years of faculty experience.

- Exclusion from the Accreditation PD or program administrator role during the previous Accreditation Review.

If a newly appointed faculty member with less than five years of experience intends to lead the accreditation preparation process and represent the program during the Accreditation Site Visit, they must have participated in at least two Accreditation Site Visits as an observer or Visit Team member before assuming the role.

Additionally, it is principally prohibited for a faculty member who previously served as the program administrator or Accreditation PD in the last Accreditation Review to take on the same role in the next Accreditation Review. This policy is not based on the individual's capability or the outcome of the previous Accreditation Review, but rather on the principle that it is unreasonable to continuously assign excessive responsibility and sacrifice to the same individual.

Since Accreditation Review is not a one-time event, the entire program faculty must engage in appropriate role distribution to minimize excessive workload. Moreover, the accreditation system must be designed so that it remains operational and sustainable, even in cases where faculty members take leaves of absence or sabbaticals.

4. Accreditation Site Visit Q&A

4.1 Issues Related to Accreditation Site Visit Agenda

1) What should be prepared for the "Entrance Meeting" on the first day of the Accreditation Site Visit?

- The Entrance Meeting is a critical part of the Visit Team's agenda, where members introduce themselves, share their areas of expertise and interests, and allocate responsibilities to effectively manage the Accreditation Site Visit schedule and agenda items. Therefore, all team members must be familiar with the latest KAAB Conditions & Procedures, the Architecture Program Report (APR), and any supplementary materials provided in advance.

- The team should discuss and clarify any questions arising from the APR and the supplementary materials submitted by the program. This discussion will help streamline the Accreditation Site Visit, enhance efficiency, and ensure a comprehensive review process.

2) Why are meetings with full-time faculty and adjunct faculty held separately?

- The meetings with both faculty groups, held in the early phase of the Accreditation Site Visit, provide valuable opportunities to observe and understand the program's strengths and weaknesses from different perspectives.

- Full-time faculty bear responsibility for the program's operation and the Accreditation Review outcome. The Visit Team must confirm their understanding of the accreditation system's purpose and intent and assess their commitment to continuous improvement of the architecture program.

- Adjunct faculty, typically invited as external experts, often have teaching experience at other institutions or professional experience. They can provide an objective perspective on the program's strengths, weaknesses, areas for improvement, and student characteristics.

- Since adjunct faculty members are usually hired by full-time faculty, separate meetings allow them to engage in open and candid discussions with the Visit Team, without the presence of full-time faculty.

3) If deficiencies are found during the facilities tour, how should the evaluation of physical resources be concluded?

- A simple pass-or-fail judgment is not appropriate. The evaluation of physical resources, along with other resource-related factors such as human resources and information resources, must be based on qualitative, performance-based assessment and should be comprehensively concluded toward the end of the Accreditation Site Visit.

- If certain deficiencies are identified, their impact on the overall quality of the educational program should be assessed based on their relative importance and significance within the context of the program.

4) Is it necessary to observe design studios and other courses?

- Yes, course observations are crucial for understanding the program's instructional methods, course content, and overall academic environment. However, they may be adjusted based on the Visit Team's workload and priorities.

- The Visit Team should avoid requiring all team members to attend every class. Instead, 1–2 members should attend select courses based on their areas of interest, ensuring that observations do not disrupt the classes.

5) Why is it necessary to engage with graduates?

- Graduates (limited to those who have completed a five-year professional degree program or equivalent) can provide valuable insights into the strengths and weaknesses of the architecture program based on their real-world professional experiences. Their feedback can help identify areas for improvement in the program's curriculum and educational approach.

6) When should the drafting of the Visit Team Report (VTR) begin?

- By the second day of the Accreditation Site Visit, the Visit Team will have gathered a comprehensive understanding of the program, allowing members to begin drafting preliminary evaluations for their assigned assessment criteria.

- Each team member should document their findings, including determinations on Met, Requiring Improvement, or Not Met conditions, along with justifications. By the afternoon of the third day, individual draft reports should be completed, consolidated, and reviewed for overall assessment.

7) Why must the finalization of the Visit Team Report (VTR) be completed during the Accreditation Site Visit?

- The Accreditation Site Visit is a comprehensive evaluation encompassing curriculum content, administrative systems, various types of student work, and educational facilities. This on-site evaluation methodology is a common practice across all international architecture accreditation systems.

- Discussions and conclusions among the Visit Team must be based on student work, site observations, and program explanations presented during the Accreditation Site Visit. Consequently, all evaluation findings must be finalized on-site.

- Once the Accreditation Site Visit ends, there is no opportunity to re-examine student work, and any additional materials not provided during the visit cannot be considered. Moreover, concerns requiring program improvements should be addressed during the visit, allowing the program a fair opportunity to respond. Therefore, the evaluation

process must be fully completed within the Accreditation Site Visit period.

8) Why must the Visit Team depart promptly after the conclusion of the Accreditation Site Visit?

- Even after the Accreditation Site Visit, follow-up procedures, including the completion and review of the Visit Team Report (VTR) and further accreditation processes, remain ongoing. To prevent any actions that could compromise the integrity of the Accreditation Review, the Visit Team must leave the university promptly after completing official site visit agenda items.

- For the same reason, it is strictly prohibited for the Visit Team to accept transportation, meals, or any form of hospitality from the university during the departure process.

4.2 Issues on Student Performance Criteria (SPC)

1) Since evaluations rely on qualitative assessments by diverse Visit Team members, isn't it difficult to maintain consistency across all schools?

- The Accreditation Review is not based on a simple quantitative assessment, and differences in individual Visit Team members' understanding of the KAAB Conditions & Procedures may result in inconsistent evaluations. However, no single evaluation item is determined solely by individual opinions. The Visit Team Chair and experienced members play a crucial role in ensuring a consistent evaluation process.

- The five members of the Visit Team, nominated by both academia and practice through KAAB's member organizations, must approach their responsibilities with professionalism and maintain fairness in all evaluations.

- As with international architecture accreditation systems, evaluations are qualitative and comprehensive, reflecting the nature of architectural education. The assessment process should be structured to guide the program toward continuous improvement while maintaining fairness and objectivity through professional judgment.

- The roles of the Visit Team Chair and experienced Visit Team members are essential for maintaining the fairness and consistency of evaluations. Additionally, open communication and consensus-building among the Visit Team members are critical.

- Variations in evaluation standards among Visit Team members or between different Visit Teams are inevitable. To minimize discrepancies, continuous discussions and collaborative decision-making are essential. KAAB also conducts annual workshops for Visit Team Chair candidates to reduce inconsistencies and ensure uniform evaluation standards.

2) How should student work be evaluated if assignments or exam questions directly quote Student Performance Criteria (SPC)?

- Student Performance Criteria (SPC) are written as minimum standards, and merely presenting them as student work does not constitute a meaningful educational outcome.

- While such work can be acknowledged as student work, its educational validity must be confirmed by syllabi, lecture materials, and supporting documents. The Visit Team must assess whether these materials effectively support learning and demonstrate a structured educational approach. If student work consists solely of repetitive descriptions of SPC without depth or critical engagement, it may not be recognized as a valid educational outcome.

- If a program's educational philosophy, objectives, and understanding of the KAAB Conditions for Accreditation are unclear, and if the preparation appears superficial or merely for accreditation purposes, the Visit Team may determine the SPC as Not Met or Requiring Improvement. The Visit Team Report (VTR) should explicitly require the program to take corrective actions.

3) Should all design student work be displayed for each design studio, and should all levels of achievement (high, medium, low) be included?

- According to the KAAB Conditions & Procedures, student work must be displayed based on sampling of the highest- and lowest-achieving work rather than a full range of evaluation grades. The program determines the appropriate quantity and type of sampling, ensuring that the selected works effectively represent the curriculum's content and characteristics.

- For example, if multiple design studios within the same academic year share the same educational objectives and content, displaying representative work from each section may not be meaningful for evaluation.

- To prevent excessive preparation burdens on the program, KAAB recommends an efficient sampling method. The Visit Team must have access to additional student work beyond the displayed samples when necessary. Therefore, the program should place supplementary materials near the Visit Team Room or provide digital access upon request.

4) If discrepancies are found between the program's SPC matrix and course content, how should they be evaluated?

- The SPC Matrix, which maps student learning outcomes to specific courses, serves as a guideline to assist the Visit Team in evaluation. A notation error in the matrix alone does not automatically indicate deficiencies in the educational content.

- The Visit Team must verify whether the corresponding SPC is adequately addressed in other required courses. If the intended SPC learning outcomes are covered in alternative required or equivalent courses, the SPC may still be deemed Met.

- However, if multiple discrepancies are found, it may indicate a lack of understanding of the curriculum and deficiencies in the self-assessment system. Depending on the severity, this could serve as a basis for a lower evaluation of the program's curricular

organization and assessment process.

5) Must Student Performance Criteria (SPC) be exclusively addressed in "Required Core Courses"?

- Not necessarily. While SPC are commonly covered in required core courses or their equivalents to ensure that all students receive a uniform level of education, some programs may choose to include them in elective courses.

- If SPC are incorporated into elective courses, the program must have a rigorous academic management system to ensure that all students achieve the required learning outcomes.

- To prevent curriculum standardization, KAAB does not mandate a specific number, type, or quantity of courses required to meet SPC. The program has full autonomy to determine how best to achieve the learning outcomes based on its unique context and educational philosophy.

- The critical factor is ensuring that all graduates meet the minimum required competencies as defined by KAAB's SPC. The Visit Team assesses whether the program has an effective assessment system that ensures equitable learning outcomes across all graduates. As a result, various curricular structures and course configurations may be employed.

6) If there are differences in interpretation and application of SPC among Visit Team members, what is the appropriate course of action?

- The Visit Team Chair, who is responsible for Accreditation Site Visit operations, has the final authority in resolving disputes. The Visit Team Chair possesses extensive experience and undergoes annual training at Visit Team Chair Workshops, ensuring familiarity with similar past cases. All Visit Team members are required to follow the Visit Team Chair's mediation.

- Differences in professional expertise and areas of interest among Visit Team members may lead to variations in SPC interpretation. If a disagreement cannot be easily resolved, the Visit Team Chair's decision takes precedence. The procedures for handling such disputes should be clearly outlined during the Accreditation Site Visit Orientation on the first day.

- While minority opinions are valuable, majority consensus must be prioritized in finalizing evaluations.

7) If the Visit Team and the program have differing interpretations of SPC, what is the appropriate course of action?

- The Visit Team must communicate its evaluation of the SPC to the program, providing an opportunity for the program to explain its perspective. This dialogue is essential in narrowing differences in interpretation and application. However, the program must support its explanation with concrete evidence, such as student work and related documents.

- If, despite thorough discussion, a resolution is not reached, the Visit Team is not obligated to persuade or adjust its findings to align with the program's viewpoint. The final decision rests with the Visit Team, based on its professional expertise and evidence presented during the Accreditation Site Visit.

- Prolonged debates over SPC interpretation may lead to unnecessary conflicts between the Visit Team and the program's faculty. To maintain a productive and professional review process, it is essential to keep discussions focused on evidence-based assessments.

4.3 Issues on Site Visit Task

1) Is the Accreditation Site Visit period too long?

- No, it is not. The Accreditation Site Visit involves an extensive workload, including the review of educational conditions, assessment of student learning outcomes, and evaluation of all site visit agenda items. Additionally, the Visit Team must reach a collective agreement on the accreditation results.

- Many experienced Visit Team members have stated that the current schedule is insufficient for thoroughly reviewing all required materials. Therefore, pre-visit preparation under the leadership of the Visit Team Chair is crucial for an efficient review process.

- While some agenda items, such as facility tours, meetings with the university president, and meal times, may not appear directly related to evaluation, they provide essential context for understanding the program. Meal times also serve as informal discussion opportunities for Visit Team members to share findings and consolidate opinions.

- However, as the accreditation cycle progresses, KAAB continues to explore potential adjustments to streamline the Accreditation Site Visit period for programs undergoing continuing accreditation.

2) What should be done if additional explanations or supplementary materials are needed from the program during the Accreditation Site Visit?

- Requests for additional materials should be made promptly to allow sufficient preparation time for the program and to facilitate the Visit Team's review process. Direct communication between Visit Team members and faculty regarding general program operations and background is encouraged, as it is an integral part of the Accreditation Site Visit.

- However, Visit Team members should exercise caution when inquiring about materials already provided in the APR or displayed in the Visit Team Room, as such requests might raise concerns about the credibility and thoroughness of the site visit process. Discussions within the Visit Team should precede any official request for additional materials.

- When specific evaluation items require further explanation or supporting materials, it is recommended that requests be made formally through the Visit Team Chair rather than on an individual basis. This ensures that the Visit Team's task allocation remains confidential. However, for minor matters, Visit Team members may support the Visit Team Chair by making informal follow-up inquiries.

- Multiple requests for additional explanations or materials may arise throughout the Accreditation Site Visit. The Visit Team Chair should evaluate the importance of the request and its impact on the site visit schedule before making a final decision.

3) Would eliminating ceremonial activities such as facility tours, course observations, and faculty interviews allow for more time to review materials?

- The mandatory agenda items in the KAAB Accreditation Procedures are designed to provide the Visit Team with a comprehensive understanding of the program's operational background and context.

- These activities play a significant role in shaping the final qualitative evaluation conducted in the latter part of the Accreditation Site Visit. They also align with international architecture accreditation practices, such as the Canberra Accord, which maintains equivalent evaluation processes across accreditation bodies.

4) What is the role of observers, and are they essential members of the Visit Team?

- Observers are not mandatory members of the Visit Team. However, observing an Accreditation Site Visit is highly valuable for institutions preparing for future accreditation. Additionally, KAAB actively promotes the observer system to enhance transparency and develop experienced accreditation professionals.

- The Visit Team Chair determines the participation scope and responsibilities of observers. In most cases, observers serve as assistant reviewers under the guidance of the Visit Team Chair, supporting the evaluation of Student Performance Criteria (SPC). However, observers are generally not permitted to participate in formal discussions with faculty or ask questions in official meetings.

- While observers may contribute opinions during evaluation deliberations, their input should be limited in cases involving sensitive decisions that must be determined solely by Visit Team members.

- Observer input can be useful in evaluations where their opinions do not significantly impact accreditation outcomes. However, if an observer exceeds their assigned role or provides biased opinions, the Visit Team Chair has the authority to restrict their participation or, in extreme cases, dismiss them from the Visit Team.

- Observers must be excluded from the preparation of the Confidential Recommendation following the final deliberation of evaluation results to maintain confidentiality.

- Depending on KAAB's policies and the program's specific circumstances, Accreditation Site Visits may also be conducted without observers.

5) Is it mandatory to display and evaluate the research work of full-time faculty?

- No, it is not a required component of the Accreditation Site Visit. The decision to display faculty research output is left to the discretion of the program and is not mandated as a formal accreditation requirement.

- While faculty research may be reviewed, it should not be considered a primary evaluation factor equivalent to student work. However, the Visit Team may take research activities into account when assessing their impact on the program's academic environment.

6) How does the evaluation of continuing accreditation differ from initial accreditation?

- The KAAB Conditions & Procedures ensure that the evaluation criteria and process remain the same for both initial and continuing accreditation.

- However, for continuing accreditation, the Visit Team must not only evaluate all accreditation criteria but also review the program's response to issues identified in the previous Accreditation Site Visit. The program must provide sufficient documentation to demonstrate improvements.

- In continuing accreditation, the Visit Team may also guide the program in developing its long-term vision and further enhancing its advanced curriculum and specialization efforts.

7) How should the Visit Team Chair respond if a Visit Team member does not adhere to the accreditation process or refuses to follow directives?

- If a Visit Team member's independent judgment or behavior disrupts the fair execution of the Accreditation Site Visit, or if they engage in conduct that violates site visit protocols, the Visit Team Chair should first issue a formal warning. This warning should clearly outline the necessary corrective actions and potential consequences of continued non-compliance.

- If a Visit Team member violates procedural guidelines, the program has the right to file a formal appeal with KAAB, citing procedural errors in the Accreditation Site Visit. Any breach of protocol that undermines the integrity of the accreditation process could damage KAAB's credibility and erode trust in the system. Additionally, individual misconduct that disrupts the Visit Team's work must be addressed by the Visit Team Chair to prevent interference with the review process.

- If the Visit Team member continues to exhibit non-compliance despite a formal warning, the Visit Team Chair has the authority to immediately dismiss them from the Visit Team, depending on the severity of the issue.