

INTERNATIONAL
ACCREDITATION/VALIDATION
ROUNDTABLE

ARCHITECTURE

Washington Accord



[Members Only](#) [Latest News](#) [FAQ](#) [Related Links](#) [Search](#) [Contact Us](#) [Home](#)

Recognized Programs

- [Frequently Asked Questions](#)
- [Principles of Good Practice](#)
- [Signatory Representatives Agreement](#)

Rules & Procedures

- [Provisional Signatory Status](#)
- [Application for Provisional Status](#)
- [Developmental Pathways for Provisional Admission](#)

A MULTINATIONAL AGREEMENT SIGNED IN 1989

- Recognizing the substantial equivalency of accreditation systems of organizations holding signatory status, and the engineering education programs accredited by them.
- Establishing that graduates of programs accredited by the accreditation organizations of each member nation are prepared to practice engineering at the entry level.

Country	Signatory Organization	Entry Year
Australia	Institution of Engineers, Australia	1989
Canada	Canadian Engineering Accreditation Board of the Canadian Council of Professional Engineers	1989
Hong Kong	Hong Kong Institution of Engineers	1995
Ireland	Engineers Ireland	1989
Japan	Japan Accreditation Board for Engineering Education	2005
New Zealand	Institution of Professional Engineers New Zealand	1989

- Home
- Who's Invited
- Country/Organization Info
- Comparative Digest
- Provisional Agenda
- Minutes/Findings
- Bulletin Board/Blog
- Related Links



Conference Members

- Australia
- Canada
- China
- CAA
- Korea
- Mexico
- United Kingdom
- United States
- UIA
- UNESCO

Welcome to the Invitational Accreditation/Validation Round Table Web Site

Statement of Conference Objectives

The purpose of the Invitational Accreditation/Validation Round Table Conference is to explore among the representatives of the invited countries and organizations the opportunities that mutual recognition among their accreditation/validation systems would create, to better understand the challenges and obstacles, and, if it should appear desirable, to create a mutual recognition agreement as to how such a program could or should be implemented.

The International Union of Architects (UIA) Council has adopted a protocol that calls for a mutual recognition agreement among like architecture education accreditation agencies throughout the world. A similar program is currently in place for the international engineering profession. To investigate the implications of mutual recognition, the National Architectural Accrediting Board, the organization responsible for the accreditation of architecture education for the United States, will chair the Invitational Accreditation/Validation Roundtable Conference to identify the interest in creating a mutual recognition agreement and the opportunities and challenges related to the creation of such an organization among existing well-established accreditation agencies. The roundtable will be jointly sponsored by the American Institute of Architects (AIA), the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA), the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), and the National Council of Architectural Registration Boards (NCARB).

In 1994, the UIA established its Professional Practice and Education commissions to develop international advisory standards for architecture education and practice. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the UIA signed a protocol in 2000 establishing the UNESCO-UIA Validation Council for Architectural Education. As a result of these commitments, the UIA Accord on Recommended International Standards of Professionalism in Architectural Practice, UNESCO-UIA Charter on Architectural Education, and UNESCO-UIA Validation System for Architectural Education were developed and adopted. These documents provide a coordinated set of advisory policies and procedures to enhance the transportability of academic and professional credentials across international borders.

The accreditation systems of Canada, the Commonwealth Association of Architects, the United Kingdom, and the United States shared their documents and experience with the UNESCO-UIA Validation Council. The Validation Council developed the UNESCO-UIA Validation System covering both



- Conference Members**
- Australia
 - Canada
 - China
 - CAA
 - Korea
 - Mexico
 - United Kingdom
 - United States
 - UIA
 - UNESCO

Country/Organization Information

Click on the links below to view the participating country/organization's documents.



AUSTRALIA



CANADA



CHINA



COMMONWEALTH ASSN. OF ARCHITECTS



REPUBLIC OF KOREA



MEXICO



UNESCO | UIA



UNITED KINGDOM





- Participants**
- Australia
 - Canada
 - China
 - CAA
 - Korea
 - Mexico
 - United Kingdom
 - United States
 - UIA
 - UNESCO

- United States**
- Add Comparative Digest Entry
 - View Comparative Digest Entry
 - View Bulletin Board/Blog Entries



List of invitees:

- The American Institute of Architects**
1735 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
- National Council of Architectural Registration Boards**
1801 K Street, NW, Suite 1100-K
Washington, DC 20006
- National Architectural Accrediting Board**
1735 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006
- Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture**
1735 New York Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20006

Designated United States Representatives:

- C. William Bevins, FAIA, NAAB President
Chairman of the Round Table Conference
- R. Wayne Drummond, FAIA, NAAB President-Elect
- Sharon Carter Matthews, AIA, NAAB Executive Director

The National Architectural Accrediting Board
1735 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-5209

NAAB Conditions for Accreditation

For Professional Degree Programs in Architecture

2004 Edition



- Conference Members**
- Australia
 - Canada
 - China
 - CAA
 - Korea
 - Mexico
 - United Kingdom
 - United States
 - UIA
 - UNESCO

Conference Digest Entries

Country/organization: United States

1. What are the mission statement, goals, and objectives of your accreditation agency? Please share a short statement of how objectivity and integrity are assured in your accreditation system.

The Mission Statement

From the 2004 Edition of the Conditions for Accreditation:

The NAAB is committed to the provision of effective professional architectural education through the establishment and application of accrediting procedures determined by a board of representative members from each of the four collateral organizations (ACSA, AIA, NCARB, and AIAS) and the public.

The NAAB is responsible for establishing policies and procedures relating to the accreditation of professional education and ensuring that schools of architecture have a clear understanding of the policies and procedures. Further, the NAAB is responsible for establishing criteria to be used by its visiting teams to assess the performance of schools and students and by the Board of Directors in determining the appropriate levels of accreditation for degree programs.

Through an atmosphere of cooperation supported by clarity of information, the NAAB strives to foster an educational foundation that prepares students who are both broadly and professionally educated for the profession of architecture.

Objectivity and Integrity Statement

Objectivity and integrity in the NAAB procedures is accomplished by



***CALL FOR
COMMENTS***

CODE OF ETHICS

EMAIL LISTSERV

OFFICERS

MEETINGS

MEMBERS

MEMBER FIELDS

MEMBERSHIP INFO

- BENEFITS

- PROCESS

- COST

NATIONAL

ACCREDITORS

NEWSLETTERS

REGIONAL

ACCREDITORS

RELATED LINKS

RESOURCES

- ASPA GOVERNANCE

- ASPA OTHER

- AUTHORED BY

OTHERS

ROLE & FUNCTION

Return To MAIN PAGE

ASPA - Member Code of Good Practice

An accrediting organization holding membership in the Association of Specialized and Professional Accreditors (ASPA):

1. Pursues its mission, goals, and objectives, and conducts its operations in a trustworthy manner.

- Focuses primarily on educational quality, not narrow interests, or political action, or educational fashions.
- Demonstrates respect for the complex interrelationships involved in the pursuit of excellence by individual institutions or programs.
- Exhibits a system of checks and balances in its standards development and accreditation procedures.
- Maintains functional and operational autonomy.
- Avoids relationships and practices that would provoke questions about its overall objectivity and integrity.
- Analyzes criticism carefully and responds appropriately by explaining its policies and actions and/or making changes.

2. Maximizes service, productivity, and effectiveness in the accreditation relationship.

- Recognizes that teaching and learning, not accredited status, are the primary purposes of institutions and programs.
- Respects the expertise and aspirations for high achievement already present and functioning in institutions and programs.
- Uses its understanding of the teaching and learning focus and the presence of local expertise and aspirations as a basis for serving effectively at individual institutions and programs.
- Keeps the accreditation process as efficient and cost-effective as possible by minimizing the use of visits and reports, and by eliminating, whenever possible, duplication of effort between accreditation and other review processes.
- Works cooperatively with other accrediting bodies to avoid conflicting standards, and to minimize duplication of effort in the preparation of accreditation materials and the conduct of on-site visits.
- Provides the institution or programs with a thoughtful diagnostic analysis that assists the institution or program in finding its own approaches and solutions, and that makes a clear distinction between what is required for accreditation and what is recommended for improvement of the institution or program.

3. Respects and protects institutional autonomy.

AGENDA

- **Session 1 – Student Performance**

Methodology utilized by the ARB to evaluate student performance

Presenter: Dr. Jon Levett, Head of Education, ARB

Discussion of the various methods utilized to develop and assess student performance, and the importance of student performance to the accreditation/validation process

AGENDA

- **Session 2 – Funding and Governance**

Presentation of the funding and governance policies of the National Architectural Accrediting Board, USA

Presenter: Sharon Matthews, AIA., Executive Director, NAAB

Discussion of funding mechanisms currently in-place by the Conference participants, and the degree to which funding impacts the governance of the accreditation/validation process

NAAB

ACSA

AIA

NCARB

AIA or
ACSA or
NCARB

President
Pres-Elect
Treasurer
Secretary

EX COM

Executive Committee
Elected Officers

AIAS

AIA

NCARB

ACSA

PUBLIC

AIAS

AIA

NCARB

ACSA

PUBLIC

AIA

NCARB

ACSA

BOARD

13 members,
Including officers

3 meetings / year

3 year terms

EXECUTIVE
DIRECTOR

Sharon Matthews

ACCREDITATION
MANAGER

Cassandra Pair

FINANCIAL
MANAGER

Ziti Sherman

INTERNATIONAL
MANAGER

Evelyn McCamey

STAFF

Washington DC

AGENDA

- **Session 3 – The Quality of Architectural Education within the Global Context**

Policies/procedures employed by the CAA to ensure the quality architectural education within the Commonwealth countries

Presenter: George Henderson, CAA Validation Panel Chair

Discussion of how each Conference participant organization assumes the responsibility for the quality of architectural education within the global context and the importance of including that responsibility within the organization's mission

MEMORANDUM OF INTENT AND UNDERSTANDING

among
the Participants
of the
Invitational Accreditation/Validation Round Table Conference

Whereas, the participants to the Invitational Accreditation/Validation Round Table Conference held in Washington, D.C., USA on 4-5 May 2006 are representatives of various national, regional and global organizations responsible for, or interested in, the accreditation/validation of architectural education; and

Whereas, the participants share the goal of developing an accord for the recognition of accreditation/validation systems allowing graduates from a study programme/course of architectural education accredited by one of the represented systems to be accepted as substantially equivalent by another, subject to additional requirements imposed by local law; and

Whereas, it was agreed that such a goal could be achieved by an international protocol that would contribute significantly to the quality of architectural education; and

Whereas, all parties recognize that substantial similarities exist among the systems, including respect for cultural diversity, and processes for accreditation/validation of study programmes/courses in architecture.

Therefore, the participants express their commitment to continue the dialogue started at this Conference with the intent of establishing such a protocol.

Adopted unanimously by those listed below:

Australia David Parker Gordon Holden	Commonwealth Assoc. of Architects (CAA) Gordon Holden George Henderson	UIA Louise Cox Fernando Ramos Galino James A. Scheeler
Canada Murray Gallant Christopher Macdonald Marina Lavrov	Korea Ju Kyoou Kim Sung Jung Chough Jee Pil Choi	United Kingdom Humphrey Lloyd Jon Levett Simon Allford
China Zhou Chang Zhou Tao Wang Xiaojing	Mexico Héctor García Escorza Fernando Mora Mora Aaron Bernal Rodriguez	United States C. William Bevis R. Wayne Drummond Sharon Carter Matthews

UNESCO
Wolfgang Tochtermann



Invitational Accreditation/Validation
Round Table Conference
May 4-6, 2006