Joint Report by the:


NEW YORK INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
School of Architecture & Design
Center for Offsite Construction

Offsite Degree Accreditation
Exploratory Task Force

# Task Force Report

August 15, 2025

## Preface

This report captures a moment in an ongoing conversation. As members of the MBI–CfOC Accreditation Task Force convened to explore the feasibility of a new degree accreditation framework for offsite construction, we did not assume fixed answers. Instead, our dialogue unfolded through observation, discovery, and reassessment. Many ideas evolved as they were discussed; others changed as research clarified their context. In several cases, earlier comments were reconsidered during the writing process, with updates captured directly in the document or through annotations and footnotes.

The work of this task force was, by design, distributed and iterative. A group of busy professionals met in small clusters—each bringing a unique vantage point, each challenging and sharpening the perspectives of others. Much of the refinement happened asynchronously, as reflections from one meeting prompted quiet re-evaluation by others. Corrections, clarifications, and footnotes were not afterthoughts—they were signs of engagement.

**Task Force Membership**

**Brent Doucette**
(MBI Member)
*Business Development Manager, Modular Division*
Axis Construction Corp.

**Stuart Emmons, FAIA**
(MBI Board member)
*Founder & Principal*
Emmons Design

**Matt Ford**
(MBI Educational Member)
*Managing Director - Center for Offsite Construction*
New York Tech

**Pamela Karp**
*Associate Professor of Occupational Therapy*
New York Tech

**Sara-Ann Logan**
(MBI Board member)
*Chief Design Officer, Principal Architect*
Volumetric Building Companies

**Heather Packard**
*Professional & Workforce Development Director*
Modular Building Institute

**Apoorva Pasricha**
(MBI member)
*Chief Operating Officer*
Cloud Apartments

**Mike Roman**
(MBI Board member)
*Co-founder & Vice President*
Reliant Asset Management (RAM)

**Randall Thompson**
(MBI member)
*PreConstruction Executive*
Nibbi Prefab

**Jason Van Nest**
(MBI Educational Member)
*Executive Director - Center for Offsite Construction*
New York Tech

## Table of Contents

## Executive Action

The Task Force concluding vote, held via email August 14 and 15, 2025, is recorded below.

| Task Force Concluding Vote #1 | | |
|---|---|---|
| Do the members of this task force **recommend the dissemination** of this report to [a] the MBI Board of Directors, [b] the Dean of the NY Tech School of Architecture & Design, and [c] the Provost of NY Tech for their consideration of supporting an offsite construction degree accrediting body? | | |
| In favor: **10** | Opposed: **0** | Abstain: **0** |

| Task Force Concluding Vote #2 | | |
|---|---|---|
| Considering the opportunities and challenges sketched in this report, do the members of this committee **recommend that the MBI and NY Tech advance their project of forming a North American offsite construction degree accrediting body**? | | |
| In favor: **10** | Opposed: **0** | Abstain: **0** |

## 1. Introduction & Thesis Review: Context for Convening the Task Force

The Modular Building Institute (MBI) and the NY Tech Center for Offsite Construction (CfOC) initiated this Task Force in mid 2025 to investigate the *feasibility* and *structure* of a new degree accreditation body tailored to offsite construction. The impetus for this effort arose from persistent indicators across the construction ecosystem: accelerating investment in modular and industrialized methods[1]; growing workforce shortages in architecture, engineering, and construction (AEC); and a marked gap between industry needs and the structure of existing academic programs.

The members of the Task Force bring diverse expertise from across the modular value chain—including academic faculty, education administrators, industry practitioners, modular manufacturers, architects, and engineers. This breadth of perspective enables the Task Force to evaluate its thesis from multiple operational and institutional vantage points. In doing so, the Task Force aims to assess a potential new degree track, the need for its dedicated accreditation, and the viability of forming a new accrediting body to support it.

### Legacy Conditions: From Engineer-to-Order to Configure-to-Order

A primary point of departure for this inquiry is the recognition that offsite construction represents a fundamental departure from traditional building delivery. Legacy AEC processes are organized around engineer-to-order (ETO) paradigms[2]—highly bespoke, sequential, and reliant on field improvisation. In contrast, modular and offsite practices increasingly follow configure-to-order (CTO) logics, where repeatable components are integrated within constrained systems for speed, cost-efficiency, and quality control.

This shift has wide-ranging implications for professional training. The competencies required to operate effectively in a CTO environment differ substantially from those cultivated in conventional AEC education. Rather than emphasizing site-specific detailing, offsite construction calls for mastery of systems thinking, systems integration, interface logic[3], productization, manufacturing tolerances, and digital coordination. Moreover, this shift is not confined to technical domains—it demands a transformation in the professional imagination of designers, requiring them to anticipate not just what a building is, but how it will be produced, shipped, assembled, and serviced.

### Articulating the Thesis: A New Category of Design Professional

The core hypothesis guiding the Task Force is as follows:

---

[1] McKinsey reports that modular construction could deliver cost savings of 20% and cut schedules by up to 50%, prompting growing investor interest worldwide. McKinsey & Company, Modular Construction: From Projects to Products (2019).

[2] Clark and Fujimoto's taxonomy of ETO vs. Configure-to-Order (CTO) systems explains the inefficiencies of bespoke production and the emergence of product-platform thinking. See Clark, K. & Fujimoto, T. (1991). *Product Development Performance: Strategy, Organization, and Management in the World Auto Industry*

[3] Baldwin and Clark argue that modular systems increase responsiveness and reduce transaction costs in complex production environments. See Baldwin, C. Y. & Clark, K. B. (2000). *Design Rules: The Power of Modularity.*

> *"A new category of design professional is emerging; one fluent in design for manufacture and construction, not traditional architecture."*

This statement recognizes the emergence of a distinct professional profile—one that blends architectural reasoning with systems thinking and manufacturing logic, and that occupies a growing role in shaping the built environment. This emerging profile is not adequately supported by existing educational models or accreditation frameworks. It requires a curricular environment that treats manufacturing constraints, interface rules, digital fabrication, and parallel delivery processes as central—not peripheral—to the learning experience.

This core is driven by many motivations: design professionals are becoming more driven by building affordable cities; the current housing affordability crisis is forcing our professionals to think differently about their careers; sustainability issues in construction are highlighted, but not addressed in engineer-to-order workflows. Several social, functional, and emotional drives are guiding the next generation's considerations of career path.

The Task Force further recognizes that this hypothesis is not simply descriptive. It is also normative: it asserts that educational infrastructure must evolve to match the structural transformation underway in the construction industry. To this end, the Task Force has begun exploring what it would take to define, evaluate, and eventually accredit academic programs that prepare graduates for this emerging role.

## Evaluation of the Thesis by the Task Force

The Task Force is structured to interrogate the thesis across three principal dimensions:

1. **Disciplinary Legitimacy** – Can this emerging field be credibly identified as a distinct discipline, rather than as a sub-field of architecture, construction management, or industrial engineering? Members with experience in accreditation, particularly in the formation of prior accrediting bodies, have framed this as a threshold issue. If the body of knowledge and practice is sufficiently novel, then dedicated accreditation is warranted. This Task Force is swayed that offsite is growing into a distinct discipline.

2. **Operational Viability** – From a legal and business standpoint, is it feasible to form and sustain an accrediting body to support this degree category? This line of inquiry has prompted the Task Force to benchmark the organizational models of existing bodies such as NAAB (architecture), ABET (engineering), and AACSB (business education), and to consider the startup structure and recognition pathways for a new entity.

3. **Market Timing and Policy Alignment** – Is now the right moment to launch this effort? Members emphasized that offsite construction has existed in various forms for over a century[4], but only recently has the policy environment begun to accelerate its mainstream adoption. State legislatures in Colorado, Oregon, and New York have all committed major funds to modular housing and research[5]. The confluence of industrial, regulatory, and public-sector interest signals that this may be a unique moment for institutionalizing educational support. It appears the answer is "Yes."

In parallel, the Task Force is working to identify leading indicators that validate the growing distinctiveness of this professional profile. These include the proliferation of offsite-focused conference tracks (e.g. at World of Modular[6] and DBIA), employer surveys indicating unmet hiring needs, and the emergence of ad hoc courses, certificates, and seminar series at architecture and engineering schools across North America.

## Early Signals from Industry and Academia

Numerous academic institutions have already begun experimenting with modular-focused coursework. At NYIT, the CfOC developed a draft Master of Science in Offsite Design and Delivery,[7] with input from a rotating cohort of Senior Research Fellows drawn from practice. That draft degree was presented publicly at the CfOC's inaugural *Future of Design and Delivery* symposium in March 2025. Participants, including industry leaders and academic faculty, were invited to critique both the course structure and the underlying thesis, thereby providing early-stage feedback on its relevance and viability.

Concurrently, the Modular Building Institute had already designated a staff lead—Heather Packard—to oversee its education strategy . Her work over the preceding year included authoring online courses based on existing industry materials. In early discussions between MBI and CfOC, it became clear that the foundational course content developed by MBI could serve as an on-ramp into more advanced academic programs. These parallel efforts converged in January 2025 with the signing of a Letter of Intent between the two organizations. That LOI formally established the joint Task Force to assess the creation of a dedicated accrediting body.

It is important to note that the efforts of individual institutions and practitioners have, until now, been scattered and provisional. What this Task Force represents is a shift from opportunistic experimentation to organized consensus-building. The aim is to synthesize dispersed initiatives into a coherent framework that provides consistency, credibility, and alignment with long-term industry needs.

---

[4] Historical analyses trace modular experimentation in the U.S. to the Sears kit homes and HUD's Operation Breakthrough in the 1970s. See Herbers, J. (1986). *The Modular Home*; Tatum, C. B. (1987). *Improving Constructability During Conceptual Planning* – Journal of Construction Engineering and Management

[5] MBI documents the growing number of U.S. states allocating funding to modular pilot programs and research initiatives. See Modular Building Institute. (2024). *Modular Advocacy Program Summary: State Legislative Wins*.

[6] Attendance and session topics at national conferences reflect the growing institutionalization of offsite knowledge-sharing.

[7] The CfOC produced a full curricular framework for a master's degree aimed at training manufacturing-informed designers. See Center for Offsite Construction. (2024). *Draft Degree Program: M.S. in Offsite Design & Delivery*. Internal white paper – and in this report's appendix.

## Chapter Conclusion

The hypothesis that a new category of design professional is emerging has found early support in both industry and academic contexts. However, the work of the Task Force is not merely to affirm this hypothesis — it is to examine its disciplinary legitimacy, operational feasibility, and timing within a broader transformation of the building industry.

The Task Force generally agrees that offsite housing production has a big position in the future of North American construction. Tomorrow's workforce development needs to address this shift. That involves academic institutions having the tools to train and certify students for the offsite space – to ensure business projections become a reality.

By analyzing both the structural misalignment between traditional AEC education and the needs of offsite practice, and the growing institutional appetite for curricular innovation, this chapter establishes a clear foundation for the Task Force's continued work. The persistent adoption of offsite methods, combined with state-level investment and industry demand, underscores the need for a dedicated accreditation framework.

The goal is not to supplant existing programs but to complement them with a new track—one that recognizes offsite construction as a maturing field with its own knowledge base, delivery paradigms, and workforce requirements[8]. This chapter marks the beginning of a shared effort to define that field, to validate its educational expressions, and to institutionalize its legitimacy through accreditation.

[8] See also The next big arenas of competition, McKinsey Report, October 2024.

## 2. Rationale for a New Accreditation Track

North America faces a housing crisis. It continues to erode our foundations as a civilized society. Housing costs are still on the rise, labor challenges grow yearly, housing options are reduced. As a result, more and more people live on our streets or in substandard housing. The current bespoke housing production system is outdated and is not keeping up with demand. Most other industries, with less impact on our core values, are far more advanced than the building construction industry. In addition, pressing this challenge, and pointing to a potentially exciting future, is the fact that many experts see modular (off-site) construction as one of the top growth industries in the next 15 years[9]. But it is not going to change on its own, it's going to require proactivity on numerous fronts to innovate this industry. One of the key fronts is education.

The current educational landscape in architecture, engineering, and construction (AEC) remains largely oriented around bespoke project delivery. Degree programs continue to emphasize individualized design development[10], site-specific coordination, and project-specific detailing. While these approaches remain essential for many aspects of building delivery, they are increasingly insufficient for preparing professionals to operate within the constraints and opportunities of modular and offsite construction.

### Persistent Misalignment Between Education and Offsite Practice

Offsite construction introduces a radically different set of priorities: repeatability, manufacturing tolerances, interface discipline, and coordinated digital workflows. Rather than designing one-off buildings, professionals working in modular environments are tasked with configuring, adapting, and integrating pre-designed components. These components—whether volumetric modules, utility cores, or facade panels—must be conceived with fabrication, transportation, and on-site assembly in mind.

Despite these demands, existing academic programs offer little formal instruction in manufacturing-informed design principles. Exposure to offsite construction is often limited to elective coursework, ad hoc studio projects, or industry-sponsored workshops. Students graduate without a structured understanding of modular logic, nor of the technical, logistical, and contractual realities that shape offsite delivery.

This gap has direct consequences in practice, especially in the US. Projects that rely on modular products frequently encounter breakdowns in coordination stemming from a lack of shared understanding among team members. It is clear how this mismatch leads to friction during execution: questions of authorship, scope, and sequencing are frequently unresolved; factory and field teams operate with different assumptions; and design professionals are often unprepared to address dimensional tolerances, lift planning, or interface hierarchies, or collaborating during the design process with manufacturing personnel.

---

[9] https://www.mckinsey.com/mgi/our-research/the-next-big-arenas-of-competition

[10] Offsite construction results in more complex teams and new team organization dynamics, much like other industries such as the automotive industry. Education can be tremendously useful in instilling the need to collaborate and giving future leaders increased skills in team building and collaboration.

These recurring issues indicate a structural misalignment between educational preparation and industry need.

In Asia, Europe, and emerging in the Middle East, off-site construction is far more advanced than in the US. The US academic and government sectors collaborating with the US private sector must learn and collaborate with international partners in the offsite construction space, to fully realize the most advanced thinking and processes through the offsite construction pipeline.

## Limitations of Existing Accreditation Frameworks

The primary accreditation bodies for AEC disciplines—NAAB for architecture, ABET for engineering, and ACCE for construction education—have not integrated offsite construction as a formal curricular expectation. While each of these organizations upholds rigorous standards for professional education, their models remain tied to traditional delivery paradigms. As a result, the content and structure of accredited programs continue to reflect assumptions about bespoke design, sequential construction, and static disciplinary boundaries. This static approach contrasts with public sector actions: Colorado recently dispersed $40 million in modular housing grants, and Oregon passed two bills totalling $45 million to support modular adoption.

Moreover, none of these frameworks provides evaluative criteria specific to modular integration, digital fabrication, or design-for-manufacture. Institutions that attempt to incorporate such content must do so without established benchmarks or peer-reviewed guidance. This absence of standards hampers consistency across programs and limits the credibility of emerging offsite-focused curricula.

Given the pace at which modular construction is evolving, and the increasing demand for repeatable solutions in housing, health care, and education, the current accreditation environment is ill-suited to guide or validate the next generation of offsite design professionals.

## A Rising Demand for Product-Oriented Thinking

The accelerating adoption of modular and offsite methods across the building industry is generating a new set of expectations for professional designers. In place of bespoke authorship, modular projects call for system-level coordination. In place of drawing-intensive documentation, they rely on precisely constrained digital models. And in place of improvisational detailing, they require adherence to repeatable, dimensionally controlled interface strategies. They also require far more familiarization with off site construction means and methods, and current and future fabrication equipment and software: including robotics, AI and other state of the art and emerging technologies.

This shift demands a new kind of design intelligence—one that blends architectural reasoning with systems thinking and manufacturing logic. Practitioners must understand how small decisions made during the design phase cascade into fabrication complexity, field risk, or supply chain inefficiencies. They must also be equipped to design components or systems that can serve across multiple projects, allowing for scalable impact and reduced cost.

Importantly, these shifts are not driven by private industry alone. Public-sector institutions—particularly at the state level—are increasingly playing an active role in accelerating offsite construction. Due to the on-going challenges bringing innovation to the US construction industry, it has become clear recently that government involvement can be hugely helpful in reducing risk for the emerging offsite industry, and spurring on progress with pilot projects and R&D funds. Over the past two years, multiple state legislatures have introduced or expanded grant programs[11], bond initiatives, and budget line items specifically targeting modular and prefabricated delivery. Academic-scale modular projects like Cal Poly's 4,200-unit student housing program underscore the broader trend: these developments are 5-15% less expensive and 25-40% quicker than traditional methods[12]. These investments have taken the form of direct support for modular housing factories, pilot funding for offsite student housing, and state agency partnerships with offsite product developers. As these programs mature, they create structural incentives for both academic institutions and industry practitioners to build capacity in this space.

In parallel, state governments are also investing in modular research. Funds have been directed toward public colleges and universities to explore standardization, certification, and workforce development for offsite methods. The scale and visibility of these investments suggest that offsite construction is being treated not as an isolated tactic, but as a platform for long-term policy alignment around affordability, speed, and sustainability. These developments reinforce the need for a professional education model tailored to the evolving ecosystem. Training professionals who can operate confidently within this productized, policy-backed environment will be essential to maintaining project quality and advancing industry credibility.

These capabilities are not currently cultivated in most academic environments. However, they are increasingly essential to the execution of modular projects. As offsite delivery becomes a core strategy for addressing housing affordability, labor shortages, and project speed, the need for product-oriented designers will only grow. The absence of an educational infrastructure to support this growth represents a bottleneck for the industry as a whole.

## Affirming the Need for a Dedicated Pathway

Given the limitations of current programs and the growing complexity of modular delivery, a dedicated accreditation track is warranted. Such a track would serve multiple purposes. First, it would provide clarity to academic institutions seeking to develop meaningful curricula in offsite construction. Second, it would enable employers to identify graduates with specialized training in modular integration, manufacturing constraints, and digital coordination. And third, it would support the development of a distinct professional identity grounded in the realities of contemporary building systems.

By establishing shared curricular expectations, evaluative rubrics, and criteria for institutional support, a dedicated track would lend legitimacy to a new class of programs. It would help distinguish comprehensive educational pathways from isolated electives or training seminars, while also enabling peer review and continuous improvement.

---

[11] Colorado & Oregon modular housing grants – Modular Advocacy Program
[12] Cal Poly campus modular units – San Francisco Chronicle

In doing so, the track would recognize that offsite construction is not a temporary[13] trend[14] or a subset of existing practice. Rather, it is an emergent domain with its own methods, workflows, and knowledge base. As such, it demands a purpose-built educational response.

It is critical to remove the bottlenecks that hold back housing innovation in the US.

### Chapter Conclusion

The rationale for a new accreditation track rests on observable misalignments, unmet industry needs, and the clear emergence of a professional profile not currently served by existing degree programs. Addressing this gap through a dedicated accreditation framework would support both academic innovation and industry transformation. It would also provide a structured pathway for training the professionals necessary to scale modular construction in response to national and global challenges.

[13] NY State 2026 Budget. (Page 480, lines 37-44) "For services and expenses of the modular and starter homes program to fund the development of starter and modular homes. Notwithstanding any other law to the contrary, the amounts appropriated herein may be suballocated or transferred to any state department, agency or public authority for the purposes stated herein (08432507) $50,000,000."

[14] Note that New York State allocated $50 million in its 2025 budget to explore modular starter homes to address affordable housing challenges.

## 3. Review of Draft Accreditation Criteria and Procedures

### Background and Purpose

As part of its charge, the Accreditation Task Force reviewed preliminary documents that outline potential **criteria and procedures** for evaluating academic programs in offsite construction. These documents, drafted by the Center for Offsite Construction (CfOC), were modeled loosely on the standards of the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB) and intended to serve as working examples—not final proposals.

The goal of this exercise was not to approve specific criteria but to spark critical feedback, identify potential alignment with existing accreditation norms, and shape a more robust and field-specific foundation for future documents. In this chapter, we summarize three core lines of engagement by the Task Force:

1. Initial reactions to the structure and content of the drafts
2. Best practices and precedents in other accreditation systems
3. Open questions and recommended areas for refinement

### Initial Reactions from the Task Force

Task Force members responded positively to the initiative behind drafting early-stage documents. Members encouraged a broader review of how other accrediting bodies structure both **criteria documents** (what to assess) and **procedures documents** (how to assess it).

In particular, several members noted that a wider sampling of accreditation models—including those for business (AACSB), engineering (ABET), and construction (ACCE)—would provide more grounded reference points for future iterations. The NAAB model was seen as an appropriate reference for structure, but not necessarily for pace or content fit. The draft was considered “ambitious in detail but narrow in scope,” prompting a recommendation to zoom out before zooming in.

Task Force members highlighted a healthy tension between aspirational manufacturing techniques (e.g. lean, Six Sigma) and the more heterogeneous practices currently observed in some modular construction factories. Accreditation criteria should reflect both aspirational standards and awareness of real-world practices. The Task Force emphasized that this dual calibration—between present practice and future potential—would be key to developing meaningful and defensible standards.

Lastly, members agreed that the current drafts can be expanded for clarity around procedural pathways—specifically:

- How institutions would initiate the accreditation process
- How initial and continuing accreditation would be granted
- How deficiencies would be addressed through feedback or remediation

- What cadence would govern re-accreditation and ongoing compliance

This procedural architecture is essential to institutional trust, and its absence was seen as a major opportunity for refinement.

### Alignment with Best Practices in Accreditation

A shared understanding emerged across the Task Force that alignment with established accreditation norms is vital—not only for credibility, but for operational viability. Participants pointed to **three guiding principles** that should animate future drafts:

1. **Efficiency** – Procedures must be lean, minimally burdensome, and sensitive to the resource constraints of academic institutions. The Task Force was clear: the goal is to accelerate the formation of offsite-focused programs, not to create administrative friction. This priority influenced both the procedural structure and the character of the evaluative criteria.

2. **Transparency** – As the accrediting body evolves, it must maintain trust through clear documentation, open-access rubrics, and defensible decision-making processes. Many accrediting bodies now publish detailed procedural documents outlining how institutions are evaluated, how decisions are made, and how appeals or exceptions are handled. These transparency mechanisms were seen as essential to legitimacy.

3. **Flexibility with Accountability** – Task Force members voiced support for a model that accommodates variation among institutions. Rather than enforcing rigid curricular formulas, the criteria should focus on outcomes: what knowledge, skills, and capabilities students acquire. This approach supports institutional autonomy while still promoting consistency and accountability.

The Task Force also endorsed **modeling future procedures on lighter-weight accreditors**—those that succeed in balancing rigor with operational efficiency. ABET, for instance, was cited for its clarity in defining student learning outcomes while allowing for variation in program delivery. By contrast, NAAB was noted as a heavier model, with detailed expectations that may be more appropriate for mature professions than for a nascent field like offsite construction.

Members additionally noted the importance of **mirroring the dynamic nature of the industry itself**. Unlike many static disciplines, offsite construction is evolving rapidly. This evolution must be reflected in accreditation procedures that encourage feedback loops, periodic revision of criteria, and adaptive processes that grow alongside the industry.

### Opportunities for Refinement and Open Questions

Several key areas for future refinement emerged from the discussion:

- **Refinement of Procedural Architecture** – The next version of the procedures document should explicitly address the **life cycle of accreditation**: how institutions initiate engagement, how reviews are conducted, how outcomes are communicated, and how compliance is maintained over time. Including mechanisms for probationary status, re-application, and appeals is critical.

- **Clarification of Criteria Scope** – The criteria document should differentiate clearly between required competencies and elective enhancements. For example, digital modeling fluency might be essential, while lean manufacturing or circular design practices may be considered exemplary but not mandatory. This layered approach allows programs to meet minimum standards while aspiring toward innovation.

- **Broader Stakeholder Consultation** – Members strongly encouraged the expansion of the consultation process. Input should be gathered from modular manufacturers, faculty members across relevant disciplines, recent graduates working in modular firms, and representatives of state education agencies. This wide-angle approach would ensure that the accreditation criteria reflect the evolving needs of practice, policy, and pedagogy.

- **Governance and Conflict of Interest Mitigation** – While not directly the topic of this chapter, Task Force members recognized that the way criteria are written, interpreted, and enforced will depend on the integrity of the accrediting body itself. As such, future drafts must anticipate governance questions and incorporate safeguards to ensure impartiality, balanced representation, and procedural fairness.

- **Relationship to Certification and Licensing** – A key open question is how this accreditation system will intersect (or not) with professional licensure, continuing education, and micro-credentialing. The group agreed that degree program accreditation is a distinct category, but its downstream effects on hiring, certification, and practice must be considered. This includes the potential for confusion or overlap with existing credentials and the need for alignment with broader workforce development efforts.

Finally, the Task Force reflected on the opportunity—and the responsibility—of creating criteria and procedures that can serve as a **foundation for a new professional identity**. Accreditation is not merely a bureaucratic filter; it is a tool for codifying values, advancing shared knowledge, and supporting excellence in education. This sense of mission will shape future iterations of the documents.

## Chapter Conclusion

The Task Force's review of the draft accreditation criteria and procedures surfaces both the ambition of this undertaking and the complexity of getting it right. While the draft documents represent a bold step forward, they must be refined through wider consultation, deeper benchmarking, and procedural clarity.

Above all, the documents must strike a balance: between rigor and accessibility, between present practice and future aspiration, and between institutional autonomy and shared standards. The review process has

made clear that such a balance is achievable—but it will require iteration, transparency, and broad engagement.

As the accrediting body takes shape, these foundational documents will serve not only as technical instruments, but as expressions of collective intent. They must encode the values of an emerging profession: one that is collaborative, product-oriented, and responsive to the needs of a rapidly changing construction economy. This chapter marks the first step in that codification process.

## 4. Legal Structure of Accrediting Body Purpose and Framing

As the Task Force contemplates the establishment of a new accrediting body for offsite construction degree programs, a foundational question arises: What legal and organizational structure will best support the mission, credibility, and independence of this entity?

This chapter explores the legal design of the proposed accrediting body through three lenses:

1. A comparison of legal structures commonly used for accrediting bodies
2. Strategies to protect against conflicts of interest—both institutional and individual
3. Recommendations to safeguard integrity, legitimacy, and long-term governance

The goal of this chapter is not to make a final determination, but to provide preliminary guidance and surface critical considerations for future legal and operational planning.

### Comparing Legal Structures

The Task Force evaluated three possible legal forms for the accrediting entity:

- **501(c)(3) Nonprofit (Educational/Charitable Purpose)**
- **501(c)(6) Trade or Business Association**
- **For-Profit Corporation (Private Entity)**

**501(c)(3)** organizations are the most common structure for professional accrediting bodies. Examples include NAAB (architecture) and ABET (engineering). These entities are recognized by the IRS as public charities with educational missions and must demonstrate that they serve the public good rather than private interests. Benefits include tax exemption, eligibility for foundation grants, and broad public trust. However, such organizations are also subject to stricter IRS reporting requirements and limits on lobbying or commercial activity.

**501(c)(6)** organizations, by contrast, are typically used for trade associations or industry alliances. MBI itself is a 501(c)(6), as are many chambers of commerce. These organizations may engage in advocacy and collective industry advancement, but they are not viewed as serving the public in the same way as 501(c)(3) charities. They can, however, still operate credibly as accrediting entities—particularly if the accreditation is framed as a quality-assurance service for members.

**For-profit structures** are rare among degree accreditors, though more common in certification or micro-credentialing contexts. A for-profit model could provide greater operational flexibility and allow investment-backed scaling, but it may undermine public trust, academic buy-in, and recognition by oversight bodies like the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) or the U.S. Department of Education.

Task Force members expressed a clear preference for a **501(c)(3)** structure. Both NAAB and ABET—benchmark organizations in adjacent sectors—use this designation, and their mission statements emphasize public benefit, educational advancement, and professional rigor. These organizations also model best practices in governance and transparency, and their nonprofit status reinforces their legitimacy as independent, impartial stewards of quality.

In parallel, the Task Force conducted early research into how accrediting bodies are classified under the IRS's **National Taxonomy of Exempt Entities (NTEE)**. NAAB, for instance, is categorized under "Educational NEC" (Not Elsewhere Classified), allowing for broad mission flexibility while maintaining educational purpose. This classification enables organizations to serve a professional field without being narrowly confined to a single educational model or delivery format.

A key recommendation from the Task Force is to **retain mission flexibility** in the founding documents. While the core activity of the accrediting body will be evaluating degree programs, the charter should be written broadly enough to allow future pivots—such as research partnerships, convenings, or support for professional development—without requiring structural overhaul or IRS reclassification.

## Insulating Against Conflicts of Interest

The credibility of any accrediting body depends not only on its legal status but also on the safeguards it establishes to **protect its decision-making processes from conflicts of interest**.

The Task Force identified three domains where protections are essential:

1. **Governance**
2. **Procedural Safeguards**
3. **Transparency and Reporting**

**Governance** structures must ensure balanced representation across stakeholder groups. This means that no single constituency—whether academic, industry, or institutional—should dominate board membership or key committees. The goal is to ensure that accreditation decisions reflect broad consensus rather than narrow interest.

Many accrediting bodies, particularly those aligned with ANSI or ISO norms, adopt **tripartite stakeholder models**—including:

- **Producers** (e.g., modular manufacturers, educators)
- **Users** (e.g., students, employers)
- **Public Interest or Neutral Experts** (e.g., legal scholars, policymakers)

This balance not only improves fairness but enhances the quality and relevance of the resulting standards.

**Procedural safeguards** begin with disclosure. All board members, committee participants, and peer reviewers should sign **conflict of interest (COI) forms** upon appointment, declaring any organizational or financial interests relevant to their role. The organization should maintain recusal procedures to prevent participants from influencing decisions where they have a personal stake. These recusals should be documented and noted in meeting minutes.

**Transparency and reporting** further protect the integrity of accreditation decisions. The Task Force recommends that final reports, evaluation rubrics, and board deliberation summaries be made available—either publicly or to member institutions—so that decisions can be scrutinized and learned from. While some confidentiality will be necessary (e.g., to protect applicant schools), the overall stance should lean toward openness.

Finally, the Task Force recommends adopting **term limits and rotation policies** for leadership roles. Staggered terms and regular turnover help prevent organizational capture and ensure that new voices continually refresh the body's perspectives.

## Preserving Integrity and Building Legitimacy

Across all three focus areas—legal structure, conflict avoidance, and transparency—the Task Force emphasized a core goal: to **build a trustworthy institution that supports the long-term credibility of offsite education**.

To do so, several additional recommendations were made:

- **Benchmark Governance Practices** – Future steps should include a structured comparison of bylaws, board formation protocols, and appeals processes used by NAAB, ABET, AACSB, and other U.S.-based accreditors. This analysis will inform the drafting of operational documents for the proposed accrediting body.

- **Clarify Pathways to Recognition** – Over time, the new accrediting body may seek recognition from third-party oversight entities such as CHEA, ANSI, or ISO. While this step is not required initially, it will be important to design the organization so that **future accreditation of the accreditor remains feasible**.

- **Avoid Overly Narrow Definitions of Mission** – As noted earlier, flexibility in charter language is essential. The mission should enable evolution in scope (e.g., from graduate programs to certificates, from U.S. focus to international partnerships) while remaining rooted in educational quality and workforce development.

- **Build Legitimacy through Usefulness** – Ultimately, the accrediting body's success will depend less on its legal form than on its value to stakeholders. Institutions must find the process credible and achievable. Employers must find the graduates well-prepared. And students must see value in the

credential. Clear communication of these value propositions will be as important as the bylaws themselves.

## Chapter Conclusion

The legal structure of an accrediting body is not merely a matter of incorporation—it is a declaration of purpose, values, and public accountability. After review of precedent organizations, the Task Force recommends the establishment of a **501(c)(3)** nonprofit structure, guided by best practices in transparency, balanced representation, and governance integrity.

The structure alone, however, is insufficient. Protecting against conflicts of interest, ensuring clarity in roles and procedures, and maintaining openness in decision-making are essential to building trust. These safeguards are not just internal controls; they are external signals of seriousness and legitimacy.

If the offsite construction field is to mature into a recognized academic and professional domain, then its educational infrastructure must rest on credible foundations. This chapter outlines the necessary first steps—legal, procedural, and ethical—to create an accrediting body capable of supporting that future.

## 5. Market Demand & Positioning

### Assessing Market Demand

The market for accredited offsite construction degrees is not speculative – it is already taking shape across North America. Recent data from the Task Force's partner-survey[15], combined with a review of NAAB, ABET, and ACCE accreditation rosters, shows that more than **450 academic institutions** already meet at least one of these bodies' standards. Within that pool:

- **21 institutions** hold accredited programs from **all three** bodies.
- **59 institutions** have a **NAAB-accredited program plus** either ABET or ACCE accreditation.

These dual- and triple-accredited schools represent an unusually strong base for early adoption: they already teach much of the design, engineering, and construction management content that an offsite degree would require. In many cases, developing an accredited offsite program would be less about inventing new courses and more about **recombining existing offerings** into a coherent, manufacturing-informed pathway.

The survey further revealed that individual faculty at many of these schools are already teaching electives, seminars, or modules on offsite and industrialized construction — often without formal institutional mandate or funding. These grassroots efforts, while modest in scale, are invaluable indicators of demand and provide a ready-made community of early champions.

### Strategic Market Positioning

1. Bottom-Up: Activate Existing Champions

The clearest short-term opportunity is to partner with academic units already experimenting with offsite-related content. Faculty in this category have demonstrated both interest and initiative, often assembling original teaching materials and pushing them through approval channels despite limited support. The new accrediting body can help consolidate these disparate efforts, giving them formal recognition and national visibility. Many of the 80 dual- or triple-accredited institutions already have such faculty in place, making them prime candidates for pilot programs.

2. Top-Down: Target Structurally Aligned Institutions

At the institutional level, the strongest prospects are **Institutes of Technology** and universities where architecture, engineering, and construction programs coexist with manufacturing or systems

[15] Randall Thompson led the Task Force partnership with the Modular Building Institute (MBI) Research & Development Council to develop a national survey targeting offsite-related coursework. The Council's instrument was designed to collect data from individual faculty who were already organizing instruction related to offsite construction or industrialized building methods. By merging this survey initiative with the Task Force's database, a coordinated national data-gathering effort was launched in late June 2025. In early July, the tool was formally presented to the Educational Task Force for broader dissemination. More in Appendix 02.

engineering departments. Schools like Georgia Tech, Illinois Institute of Technology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, and New York Institute of Technology already operate at the intersection of design, fabrication, and industry. They can assemble an offsite construction degree largely from **existing internal assets**, drawing on expertise across multiple disciplines without having to hire extensively or build new infrastructure.

Mapping these overlaps reveals a clear target list for outreach: institutions that are (a) accredited in two or three relevant domains, and (b) already positioned to bridge design, engineering, and manufacturing in their curricula. For these schools, the barrier to launching an accredited offsite degree is low, and the incentive — new enrollment channels, industry relevance, and a differentiated program identity — is high.

### Bridge to Appendix 02

A detailed list of these dual- and triple-accredited institutions (along with survey data identifying where offsite coursework is already being taught) appears in **Appendix 02: "Low-Hanging Fruit" — Academic Institutions Pre-primed to Join**. These tables show which schools combine the right accreditation profile with emerging faculty expertise, offering a clear roadmap for targeted engagement.

### Chapter Conclusion

The combination of faculty-led innovation and institution-level structural alignment creates a solid, quantifiable base of early adopters for an offsite construction accrediting body. By engaging these frontrunners — from individual champions to fully aligned Institutes of Technology — the initiative can enter the market with both momentum and a clearly defined constituency. The opportunity is not to convince the unconvinced, but to **amplify and formalize what is already emerging** into a visible, national movement.

## 6. Metrics and Market Penetration Goals

Establishing an accrediting body for offsite construction degree programs requires a framework for measurement. Clear metrics are essential to evaluate whether the body is achieving its stated goals and responding effectively to the evolving needs of both industry and higher education. This chapter outlines a three-phase model for tracking progress and performance: (1) the pre-launch stage of forming the non-profit; (2) the first year of operation; and (3) the third year, when the organization begins to consider professionalization and full-time staffing. At each stage, the Task Force recommends a series of key performance indicators (KPIs) that reflect both internal progress and market-facing adoption.

### I. Stage One: Pre-Launch and Non-profit Formation

The formation of the accrediting body requires early indicators of institutional readiness and demand. These metrics do not yet assess educational outcomes but instead focus on foundational capacity—securing philanthropic support, defining governance, and aligning with potential academic partners. This stage centers on validating the need for the accrediting body and demonstrating operational viability.

**Recommended KPIs:**

**1. Foundational Commitments**

- Number of founding institutions, firms, or philanthropic partners
- Total seed capital raised (including grants, donations, and pledges)
- Number of signed Letters of Intent (LOIs) or Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) from prospective academic partners

**2. Pipeline and Interest Indicators**

- Total number of (polytechnic) institutions identified as qualified “curriculum already in place” leads[16] (i.e., those with both construction/architecture and manufacturing-related programs)
- Number of institutions surveyed or interviewed to validate interest in accreditation
- Engagement metrics from outreach efforts (e.g., webinar attendance, mailing list sign-ups, institutional inquiries)

**3. Organizational Readiness**

- Completion and filing of non-profit status
- Access to critical number of students (or amount of dues) represented in LOIs

[16] See Appendix 2 for a list of institutions hosting many related accredited programs.

- Ratification of mission statement, bylaws, and governance documents
- Completion of version 0.9 of accreditation standards (for pilot circulation)
- Launch of public website and communications channels

## II. Stage Two: Year One Operations

In the first year, the accrediting body shifts from planning to execution. Success is measured by the quality and quantity of institutional engagement: how many degree programs enter the pipeline, how many reach candidacy, and how effectively the accrediting body supports them. KPIs in this phase should also track the early footprint of accredited offsite programs and student participation.

**Recommended KPIs:**

**1. Adoption and Accreditation**

- Number of formal applications for accreditation submitted by academic institutions
- Average time from initial inquiry to candidacy status
- Number of academic departments (architecture, construction, manufacturing) participating at each institution

**2. Market Penetration**

- Percentage of identified qualified institutions that engage with the accrediting body
- Geographic spread of engaged institutions (to promote equitable national distribution)
- Number of new offsite-focused courses or concentrations launched following engagement

**3. Stakeholder Engagement**

- Total student enrollment in accredited or candidate offsite degree programs
- Feedback scores from participating faculty and administrators (e.g., satisfaction with the accreditation process)
- Retention rate of engaged institutions into the second year

**4. Institutional Development**

- Number of site visits completed or scheduled
- Finalization of version 1.0 of the accreditation standards
- Establishment and training of peer review board or visiting teams

## III. Stage Three: Year Three Professionalization and Scale

By year three, the accrediting body should be positioned to demonstrate sustained impact and to consider long-term professionalization. KPIs at this stage focus on cumulative program adoption, graduate outcomes, financial sustainability, and internal capacity.

**Recommended KPIs:**

**1. Scale and Impact**

- Cumulative number of accredited offsite construction degree programs
- Year-over-year growth rate in new applications and accreditations
- Number of students graduated from accredited programs
- Availability of employment outcome data (e.g., graduate placement in offsite construction or related sectors)

**2. Financial Sustainability**

- Annual operating budget and balance sheet
- Share of revenue from institutional fees versus philanthropic support
- Institutional renewal rate for annual accreditation dues
- Number and success rate of external grant proposals submitted

**3. Organizational Capacity**

- Number of full-time staff hired and onboarded
- Staff-to-institution ratio
- Accreditation cycle time (from initial contact to final decision)
- Cost-per-accreditation metrics for internal benchmarking

**4. Reputation and Influence**

- Participants contributing to industry standards, academic research consortia, or national education initiatives
- Number of references to the accrediting standards in institutional catalogs, job postings, or public procurement documents
- Strategic partnerships formed with complementary organizations (e.g., NAAB, ABET, ICC, NIBS)

## Chapter Conclusion

These metrics ensure that progress can be measured and expectations met. They offer a roadmap for navigating the uncertainties of early formation, initial engagement, and long-term institutionalization. The

Task Force recommends that these indicators be reviewed and refined annually by the accrediting body's board, and that key data points be published publicly as part of a broader commitment to transparency. These KPIs also serve a strategic purpose: to build confidence among donors, attract high-performing academic institutions, and advance a new model of professional education that reflects the industrialized future of construction.

## 7. Financial Model

### Introduction: A Philosophy of Lean Operations

The Task Force drafted three financial models for administering a future accrediting body's first five years of life. These models are detailed in **Appendix 04: Budget Models**. The findings below offer strategic actions with the context of these three models.

The Task Force strongly recommends that the new accrediting body adopt a **lean financial structure** from the outset. While initial philanthropic support is necessary to establish legal and operational foundations, ongoing sustainability must be driven by modest institutional fees, streamlined staffing, and minimal overhead.

The proposed financial stance is built around four principles:

- **Philanthropic Setup**: Use donations and grant support to fund 501(c)(3) formation, board development, standards drafting, and first-year outreach.
- **Lean Administrative Structure**: Minimize staffing overhead while maximizing staff effectiveness through delegation, partnerships, and standardized workflows.
- **Lean Operational Footprint**: Avoid high fixed costs in office space, travel, and software—favor lightweight systems and embedded university partnerships.
- **Scalable Efficiency**: As the program expands, resist bureaucratic growth by investing in network-based models, contracting, and automation.

### Revenue Model

#### A. Start-up Capital (Year 0–1)

- Major philanthropic donations (foundations, industry sponsors)
- HUD, DOE, or workforce innovation grants
- Industry partner donations (NAHB, MHBA, etc.)

#### B. Earned Revenue (Years 1–5)

- **Accreditation Application Fees** (e.g., $4,000 per program)
- **Annual Maintenance Fees** (e.g., $6,000–$8,000 tiered by size)
- **Site Visit Administration Fees** (e.g., $5,000 flat; travel billed separately)
- **Optional Support Services** (e.g., $1,000–$2,000 per program for training, toolkits)

#### C. Stretch Revenue Opportunities

- Industry-level partnerships for workforce development interested stakeholders

- Licensing, microcredential, or certification workshops
- Data dashboards or reporting subscriptions for institutional benchmarking

## Cost Structure

### A. Staffing – Lean and Phased

- Year 1: 2–3 FTEs (Executive Director, Accreditation Manager, Operations Coordinator)
- Use peer reviewers and contractors for evaluation cycles
- Delay hiring communications and policy roles until Year 3+
- Cap staff growth by investing in systems, not hierarchy

### B. Operational Costs

- Use university-partnered or co-working space (not leased office)
- Cloud-based project management and document handling
- Contract bookkeeping, legal, and audit services until needed full-time

### C. Travel and Site Visits

- Visiting team travel reimbursed directly by institutions (not paid by accreditor)
- Use hybrid visit formats where possible
- Standardize travel policies for predictability

## Growth Without Bloat: Staying Lean at Scale

Even as the number of accredited programs grows, the Task Force advises against organizational sprawl. Instead, growth should follow these principles:

- **Modular growth:** Add part-time or contract staff only during accreditation cycles
- **Digital first:** Use tech platforms for submissions, evaluations, and renewals
- **Peer governance:** Rotate academic and industry reviewers into site visit roles
- **Transparent budgeting:** Set staff-to-program ratios and cap fixed cost expansion

Five categories the accrediting body can study to stay revenue positive:

1. **Increase Annual Fees by 15–25%** NAAB's high-end fees reach $11K+ for large programs. Raising the annual fee to ~$8K–$9K would dramatically improve sustainability.

2. **Add Tiered Services** the body may offer paid add-ons:

    - Fast-track reviews

- Accreditation prep workshops
- Access to curricular toolkits
- Peer network memberships

3. **Limit Staff Growth** The body need not scale staff linearly. It can use part-time peer reviewers, administrative software, and rotating advisory panels to cap labor costs.

4. **Grow Program Count Faster** Reach 50+ accredited programs by Year 5. This could double earned revenue—but only if overhead remains controlled.

5. **Introduce Industry-Level Partnerships** Allow industry organizations to join as strategic partners to seed fund the accreditor's bootstrapping and continue support for the broader mission (501(c)(**3**)s, 501(c)(**4**)s, 501(c)(**6**)s).

## Chapter Conclusion

The goal is not to build a bureaucracy but to **maintain a standards body with precision, flexibility, and fiscal restraint**. Philanthropic support should underwrite experimentation and network-building in the early years. Thereafter, modest institutional fees must cover recurring costs. By resisting overgrowth and designing for efficiency, the accrediting body can serve more programs—and evolve with the offsite industry—without requiring permanent external subsidy.

## 8. Accreditation of the Accreditor

The United States has no Federal Ministry of Education or other centralized authority exercising single national control over postsecondary educational institutions in this country. The States assume varying degrees of control over education, but, in general, institutions of higher education are permitted to operate with considerable independence and autonomy. As a consequence, American educational institutions can vary widely in the character and quality of their programs.

In order to ensure a basic level of quality, the practice of accreditation arose in the United States as a means of conducting non-governmental, peer evaluation of educational institutions and programs.[17] Private educational associations of regional or national scope have adopted criteria reflecting the qualities of a sound educational program and have developed procedures for evaluating institutions or programs to determine whether or not they are operating at basic levels of quality.

### Guidelines

Accreditation agencies themselves can be accredited, typically by a higher-level accrediting body. This process ensures the quality and credibility of the accrediting agencies themselves.

1. Accreditation of Institutions vs. Agencies:
    - Accreditation is typically sought by educational institutions (schools, colleges, universities, programs) to demonstrate they meet established standards of quality.
    - However, accrediting agencies, which are the organizations that grant accreditation, can also be evaluated and accredited by other bodies.

2. The Purpose of Accrediting Accrediting Agencies:
    - To ensure the accrediting agencies themselves are upholding high standards of quality and integrity in their accreditation practices.
    - To provide a level of oversight and accountability for accrediting bodies.

3. How it Works:
    - Accrediting agencies voluntarily seek recognition from a higher-level body, such as the U.S. Department of Education or the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA).
    - These higher-level bodies review the accrediting agency's standards, processes, and practices to ensure they meet specific criteria for recognition.
    - The review process often involves an on-site evaluation by a team of experts.
    - If the accrediting agency meets the required standards, it is granted recognition or accreditation by the higher-level body.

[17] For more information see the US Department of Education:
https://www.ed.gov/laws-and-policy/higher-education-laws-and-policy/college-accreditation/accreditation-in-the-us

4. Examples:
    - The U.S. Department of Education recognizes accrediting agencies for institutions of higher education, particularly for purposes of federal student aid programs.
    - CHEA recognizes accrediting agencies that meet its standards for quality and effectiveness.

5. Importance:
    - Accreditation of accrediting agencies provides assurance to institutions, students, and the public that the accreditation process is credible and reliable.
    - It helps to maintain the integrity of the accreditation system and prevents the proliferation of "accreditation mills".

## 10. Challenges, Roadmap & Task Force Conclusion

This chapter summarizes the most pressing implementation challenges, sketches a conceptual roadmap for early deployment, and articulates the limits—and intent—of this report.

The recommendations herein are not prescriptive blueprints, but a synthesis of concerns, scenarios, and conditional strategies. We aim to offer future stewards of this effort the clearest possible view of what lies ahead.

### Structural and Financial Challenges

The most formidable challenge to launching a new accrediting body for offsite construction is not demand; it is institutional infrastructure. A consensus emerged in the Task Force that the early years of this accrediting body will be financially fragile, especially if external grant funding or stakeholder underwriting is not secured in advance. The budget models drafted by the Task Force assume a modest fee structure, conservative adoption rates, and volunteer-based evaluation, yielding operational deficits in the first three years. The models are not a shortcoming, but a candid acknowledgement: this effort cannot be launched without support.

Two historical analogues guided our assessment.

- The first, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), sustains itself through a combination of school evaluation fees and long-term “collateral partnerships” – major industry bodies such as the AIA, AIAS, ACSA, and NCARB.

- The second, ABET, achieves sustainability through accreditation fees by operating at a significantly larger scale and recognizing volunteer contributions as donated services.

While the proposed offsite accrediting body cannot immediately replicate either model, it must reckon with their implications. In short: institutional partnerships and stakeholder underwriting are not optional—they are essential.

This conclusion catalyzed a productive line of discussion within the Task Force. Members explored revenue augmentation opportunities through stakeholder vetting and credentialing services, and endorsed a model wherein MBI, AIA, or others might underwrite early-year operations in exchange for influence over governance or accreditation criteria. If those entities view this effort as a pipeline for their own future workforce and membership base, they may be motivated to contribute not merely with endorsements, but with capital and personnel.

## The Early Roadmap: Conditions for Launch

This Task Force was explicitly not charged with producing a fixed roadmap or flowchart, but still believes it is appropriate to describe several indicators of readiness that could inform a launch decision.

First, a cohort of early adopters must be identified and engaged. Our analysis suggests that institutions already holding accreditation in architecture (NAAB), engineering (ABET), and construction (ACCE) are most likely to succeed in launching a qualifying program with minimal additional investment. These schools can mix and match existing courses to meet core criteria, avoiding the arduous path of new course development. The Task Force has already compiled a database of these institutions and mapped the accreditation overlaps, establishing a foundation for outreach and recruitment.

Second, the model curriculum effort must proceed apace. As Pamela Karp and others noted, prospective programs benefit greatly from clear templates—what courses count, how they count, and how gaps can be filled. The curriculum should be designed to allow flexibility, enabling institutions to adopt, adapt, or supplement existing coursework. This work is already underway at the Center for Offsite Construction and will be critical to accelerating program uptake and reducing administrative friction.

Third, the first years of operation should rely heavily on volunteer labor. This is not an ideal condition, but a pragmatic necessity. Until a critical mass of programs is reached, the accrediting body will depend on donated services from seasoned industry professionals—vetted and trained in collaboration with MBI, AIA, or similar organizations. These same organizations may also contribute to the vetting process itself, forming the early governance structure of what NAAB refers to as “collateral partners.”

Fourth, and most importantly, no launch should proceed unless a small number of institutions are willing to commit in advance. A go/no-go threshold should be established, tied to at least three tangible commitments: (1) seed funding or in-kind underwriting by institutional partners; (2) a confirmed cohort of candidate programs, ideally with cross-disciplinary accreditation; and (3) volunteer interest in serving as evaluation reviewers.

Without these commitments in place, the Task Force advises deferring the formal creation of the accrediting body until conditions mature. The report’s authors emphasize that this is not a matter of pessimism, but of stewardship.

## Task Force Reflections

This report began with an ambitious charge: to assess the feasibility of a national accreditation body for offsite construction degrees. Our collective effort has surfaced both great optimism and sobering complexity.

We are persuaded that the demand for such programs is real, that curricular materials are within reach, and that the standards-setting process is within the capability of our sector. But we are also persuaded that this

effort cannot succeed without coalition-building, fiscal realism, and an adaptive structure capable of maturing over time.

It is therefore the judgment of this Task Force that the concept is sound, the need is clear, and the road is navigable — but that the next phase must be approached with care, coalition, and conditional commitments.

This report is intended as a reference point for that next phase; it is a compass, not a contract.

We look forward to seeing this vision tested, refined, and realized.

## Appendix 01: Accreditation Fees Structures in Similar Programs

Accrediting bodies such as **NAAB** (National Architectural Accrediting Board) and **ABET** (Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology) rely primarily on program-related fees to fund their operations — complemented by contributions and in-kind support.

### NAAB Fee Structure

NAAB's model includes several distinct charges (2025–28) that support a staff of nine identified employees:

1. **Eligibility Application Fee** – a one-time flat fee (~$600 in 2025) for programs applying to begin accreditation (NAAB).

2. **Architecture Program Report (APR) Fee** – payable each time a program submits its self-study report (~$3,000 in 2025) (NAAB).

3. **Site-Visit Fee** – tiered by visit type:

    - *Initial candidacy/continuing candidacy visits*: ~$3,300 (3 visitors)
    - *Initial accreditation*: ~$4,400 (4 visitors)
    - *Continuing accreditation*: ~$4,400 (4 visitors) or ~$5,500 (5 visitors for two programs) (NAAB). **Important:** These site-visit fees cover NAAB's administrative overhead but *do not include* travel, lodging, meals, or other expenses incurred by the visiting team (NAAB).

4. **Annual Fee** – tiered according to program size (enrollment), ranging from ~$4,400–$7,100 for small programs up to ~$7,100–$11,700 for large programs, covering core accreditation activities (NAAB).

NAAB also offers additional services (such as its International Certification, EESA transcript evaluations, etc.) with separately enumerated fees (NAAB).

### ABET Fee Structure

ABET's fee schedule (U.S. cycle, 2025–26) uses:

1. **Readiness Review Fee** – a preliminary assessment (~$1,155/program) (ABET).

2. **Accreditation Program Review Fees** – tiered based on evaluation complexity:

    - Base fee: ~$4,040/program
    - +$4,040/evaluator

- Additional: ~$420 for multiple programs or extra evaluator days (ABET). Like NAAB, ABET excludes travel costs—institutions reimburse actual travel, lodging, meals, visas, and insurance for evaluators (ABET).

3. **Interim Report & Termination Fees** – around $2,035–4,040 per report or visit (ABET).

4. **Annual Maintenance and Accreditation Fees** – invoiced post-accreditation, with multi-year review cycles; overseas programs may pay additional curricular fees (ABET).

### ACCE Fee Structure

ACCE's fee schedule does not illustrate a divergent model from the above: it is skipped in this summary.

### What Is *Not* Included in These Models

Neither NAAB nor ABET includes the **direct expenses of visiting teams**—such as airfare, lodging, meals, visas, and local transport—which are reimbursed by the institution. Both bodies separate **application/reporting fees** from **site-visit logistics**, ensuring financial transparency while allowing institutions to manage their own travel budgets.

### Summary

NAAB and ABET employ multi-tiered fee structures tailored to program type, enrollment, and review cycles. They differentiate between administrative/case-review fees and reimbursable logistics expenses, enabling predictable forecasting while ensuring institutions shoulder variable travel costs. This model secures consistent revenue to sustain accreditation activities while maintaining clarity and fairness for participating programs.

## Appendix 02: 'Low-Hanging Fruit'... Academic Institutions Pre-primed to Join

Many universities **already have the building blocks for an accredited offsite construction degree hiding in plain sight**. Programs meeting NAAB, ABET, or ACCE accreditation requirements are already teaching much of the technical, design, and management content an offsite accrediting body would require.

For these institutions, the path forward is less about inventing new coursework and more about strategically combining existing offerings into a coherent, manufacturing-informed degree pathway. This "curricular remix" not only simplifies program development but **also creates a fresh enrollment driver, offering students new, industry-relevant credentials while maximizing the value of faculty and resources** already in place.

### Quantitative Findings

From the combined accreditation review and survey:

- **450 academic institutions** in North America hold at least one NAAB, ABET, or ACCE-accredited program.
- **21 institutions** hold accredited programs from **all three** bodies.
- **89 institutions have accredited programs from 2 of the 3 accrediting bodies.** Among those, **59** have a NAAB-accredited program plus either ABET or ACCE accreditation.
- Within these 80 high-potential institutions, the survey identified faculty already teaching offsite or industrialized construction content in **more than 50%** of cases.
- An approximate "Ease of Conversion" metric was attempted in some tables. The metric weighed the presence of NAAB and ABET accreditations slightly more heavily than ACCE, since these accreditations are more onerous and technically involved. Universities with NAAB & ABET accreditations in place will logically be capable and motivated to seek an offsite accreditation to amplify prior effort.

**Table 01a – North American Academic Institutions with Degrees Accredited by NAAB, ABET, and ACCE** (all three)**.**

Yellow highlighted programs are already teaching offsite curricula identified in the survey preview in Table 02.

| | Institution Name | Offsite Coursework Detected | Ease of Conversion (1–3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Arizona State University | No | 2.5 |
| 2 | Auburn University | Yes | 3 |
| 3 | California Baptist University | No | 2.5 |
| 4 | California Polytechnic, San Luis Obispo | No | 2.5 |
| 5 | Clemson University | No | 2.5 |
| 6 | Drexel University | No | 2.5 |
| 7 | Dunwoody College of Technology | No | 2.5 |
| 8 | Florida International University | No | 2.5 |
| 9 | Georgia Institute of Technology | No | 2.5 |
| 10 | Kansas State University | No | 2.5 |
| 11 | Kennesaw State University | No | 2.5 |
| 12 | Mississippi State University | No | 2.5 |
| 13 | North Dakota State University | No | 2.5 |
| 14 | Ohio State University | No | 2.5 |
| 15 | Prairie View A&M University | No | 2.5 |
| 16 | Texas A&M University | No | 2.5 |
| 17 | University of Oklahoma | Yes | 3 |
| 18 | University of Tennessee, Knoxville | No | 2.5 |
| 19 | University of Texas at San Antonio | No | 2.5 |
| 20 | University of Washington | No | 2.5 |
| 21 | Washington State University | No | 2.5 |

## Table 01b – Institutions with two of three Accreditations NAAB, ABET, and/or ACCE

Yellow highlighted programs are already teaching offsite curricula identified in the survey preview in Table 02.

| | Institution Name | NAAB | ABET | ACCE | Ease of Conversion (1–3) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Alfred State College | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 2 | Ball State University | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 3 | Boise State University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 4 | Bowling Green State University | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 5 | Bradley University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 6 | California Poly University, Pomona | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 7 | California State University, Chico | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 8 | California State University, Fresno | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 9 | California State University, Long Beach | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 10 | California State University, Northridge | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 11 | California State University, Sacramento | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 12 | Carnegie Mellon University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 13 | Central Connecticut State University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 14 | Colorado State University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 15 | Cornell University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 16 | Fairmont State University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 17 | Florida A&M University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 18 | Florida Atlantic University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 19 | Florida Gulf Coast University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 20 | Florida Institute of Technology | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 21 | Georgia Southern University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 22 | Howard University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 23 | Illinois Institute of Technology | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 24 | Indiana State University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 25 | Kent State University | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 26 | Lamar University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 27 | Lawrence Technological University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 28 | Louisiana State University | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 29 | Louisiana Tech University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 30 | Marywood University | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 31 | Michigan State University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 32 | Michigan Technological University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 33 | Minnesota State University, Mankato | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |

| | Institution Name | NAAB | ABET | ACCE | Ease of Conversion (1–3) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | Morgan State University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 35 | New Jersey Institute of Technology | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 36 | New York City College of Technology | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 37 | Northeastern University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 38 | Northern Arizona University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 39 | Norwich University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 40 | Oklahoma State University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 41 | Oregon State University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 42 | Pennsylvania College of Technology | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 43 | Pennsylvania State University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 44 | Polytechnic University of Puerto Rico | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 45 | Portland State University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 46 | Princeton University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 47 | Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 48 | Rice University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 49 | Rochester Institute of Technology | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 50 | Roger Williams University | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 51 | South Dakota State University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 52 | Syracuse University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 53 | Tarleton State University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 54 | Temple University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 55 | Texas State University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 56 | Texas Tech University | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 57 | University of Alaska Anchorage | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 58 | University of Arizona | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 59 | University of Arkansas | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 60 | University of Arkansas, Little Rock | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 61 | University of California, Berkeley | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 62 | University of California, Los Angeles | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 63 | University of Detroit Mercy | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 64 | University of Florida | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 65 | University of Hartford | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 66 | University of Houston | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 67 | University of Idaho | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 68 | University of Illinois at Chicago | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 69 | University of Louisiana at Lafayette | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |

| | Institution Name | NAAB | ABET | ACCE | Ease of Conversion (1–3) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 70 | University of Massachusetts Amherst | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 71 | University of Memphis | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 72 | University of Miami | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 73 | University of Michigan | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 74 | University of Nebraska - Lincoln | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 75 | University of Nevada - Las Vegas | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 76 | University of New Mexico | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 77 | University of North Florida | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 78 | University of North Texas | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 79 | University of Notre Dame | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 80 | University of South Florida | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 81 | University of Southern California | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 82 | University of Southern Mississippi | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 83 | University of Texas at Arlington | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 84 | University of Texas at Austin | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 85 | University of Utah | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 86 | University of Wyoming | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 87 | Virginia Tech | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2.4 |
| 88 | Wentworth Institute of Technology | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2.2 |
| 89 | Western Kentucky University | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2.4 |

## Table 02 – Survey-Identified Offsite Coursework and Degree Programs

| Institution Name | Program (or Unit) Offering Offsite Content | Degree Type |
|---|---|---|
| New York Tech | School of Architecture & Design | Masters |
| New York Tech | School of Architecture & Design | Bachelors |
| University of Florida | Construction Management | Bachelors |
| University of Florida | Construction Management | Masters |
| University of New Brunswick | Civil Engineering | Bachelors |
| University of New Brunswick | Construction Engineering & Management | Bachelors |
| University of New Brunswick | Construction Engineering & Management | Masters |
| Auburn University | School of Building Science | Bachelors |
| Algonquin College | Construction Project Management | Bachelors |
| Northeastern University | School of Architecture | Masters |
| University of Arizona | School of Architecture | Bachelors |
| Stanford University | Sustainable Design and Construction | Bachelors |
| The University of Oklahoma | Construction Science | Bachelors |
| University of West Florida | Construction Management | Bachelors |
| Wolverhampton (Canada) | School of Engineering | Masters |
| Vermont State University | Architectural Engineering Technology | Bachelors |

### Observations

- Triple-accredited institutions (Table 01a) have in-house expertise across architecture, engineering, and construction — ideal for **fully integrated offsite degrees**.
- Dual-accredited institutions (Table 01b) often require minimal expansion to round out their offering, making them strong candidates for **fast-track pilot programs**.
- Survey-highlighted faculty (Table 02) are critical “entry points” — early champions who can help move programs from concept to launch.

### Next Steps for Engagement

1. **Prioritize triple-accredited institutions** for initial outreach — they have both the breadth and depth to move quickly.
2. **Pair survey-identified faculty with institutional leadership** to build bottom-up and top-down alignment.
3. **Offer template curricula** showing how existing courses can be remixed to meet offsite accreditation standards with minimal new content creation.

## Appendix 03: Reference Documents

### Offsite Construction for Housing: Research Roadmap (Jan 24, 2023, MOD X & HUD)

This research roadmap and recommended research priorities for the Department of Housing and Urban Development and broader public-private collaborations.

### The Next Normal in Construction (2020, McKinsey & Co.)

How disruption is reshaping the world's largest ecosystem. (Exec Summary)

### Modular construction: From projects to products (2019, McKinsey & Co.)

Modular construction—pre-manufacturing building sections off-site and assembling them on site—offers a transformative productivity boost, capable of accelerating built projects by 20–50% and cutting costs by up to 20% in repeatable building types such as hotels, housing, healthcare, and education. (Brief) (Blog) (2023 Article).

### Building Affordability by Building Affordably (2017, Terner Center for Housing Innovation)

Exploring the Benefits, Barriers, and Breakthroughs Needed to Scale Off-Site Multifamily Construction.

### The Evolution of Technology Adoption in Construction

(September 18, 2023) Zacua Ventures.

### The Offsite Revolution in Construction

(May 08, 2019) Boston Consulting Group.

### A Sustainable Transition to Industrialized Housing Construction in Developing Economies

(June 2020)

### Shaping the Future of Construction: A Breakthrough in Mindset and Technology

(2016) World Economic Forum

## Appendix 04: Budget Models

What follows are three financial models that illustrate possible funding streams for the future accrediting body. **Note that each model conservatively assumes <50 programs** (based on the "21+89" market research documented in Appendix 02).

### Model A: Bootstrapping to Positive Fee-focused Revenue

This financial model assumes no outside granting (from HUD, AVDFs, etc.) It illustrates that the accrediting body must charge accreditation fees (new, or renewal) to approximately 25 institutions per year to become self-sufficient with a staff of [1] ED, [2] part-time marketing, and [3] admin.

Statement of Activities A

| (No Outside Grants, ED starts Year 2, mid-year) | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Accredited Programs** | **0** | **3** | **9** | **24** | **42** |
| New Applications | 3 | 6 | 15 | 18 | 20 |
| Renewals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| **Revenue** | **$105,800** | **$185,600** | **$305,500** | **$407,800** | **$508,000** |
| **Earned Revenue** | **$42,300** | **$96,600** | **$247,500** | **$349,800** | **$450,000** |
| Accreditation Fees (application + annual dues) | $15,000 | $30,000 | $75,000 | $90,000 | $100,000 |
| Site Visit or Evaluation Fees | $12,000 | $24,000 | $60,000 | $72,000 | $80,000 |
| Training & Workshop Fees | $3,300 | $6,600 | $16,500 | $19,800 | $22,000 |
| Institutional Membership | $12,000 | $36,000 | $96,000 | $168,000 | $248,000 |
| **Contributed Revenue** | **$63,500** | **$89,000** | **$58,000** | **$58,000** | **$58,000** |
| Corporate Sponsorships | $15,000 | $22,000 | $24,000 | $25,000 | $25,000 |
| Individual Donations | $14,000 | $18,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 |
| Restricted Program Grants (e.g. to fund curriculum development) | $0 | $21,500 | $10,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 |
| Unrestricted Operating Grants | $19,500 | $12,500 | $5,000 | $5,000 | $5,000 |
| In-Kind Contributions | $15,000 | $15,000 | $9,000 | $8,000 | $8,000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Expenses** | **$95,500** | **$164,000** | **$365,200** | **$448,890** | **$457,218** |
| **Program** | **$19,000** | **$12,000** | **$26,000** | **$26,000** | **$27,000** |
| Consultant & Contract Services (Program) | $15,000 | $3,000 | $14,000 | $12,000 | $12,500 |
| Travel & Conferences (Program Delivery) | $4,000 | $9,000 | $12,000 | $14,000 | $14,500 |
| **Management & General Salaries** | **$76,500** | **$134,000** | **$320,600** | **$402,430** | **$407,712** |
| Salaries & Benefits | $0 | $84,000 | $266,000 | $343,000 | $343,000 |
| Administrative Rent & Utilities | $0 | $12,000 | $12,600 | $13,230 | $13,892 |
| Office Supplies & Equipment & IT | $2,500 | $3,000 | $3,500 | $3,850 | $4,235 |
| Professional Fees (Accounting, Legal) | $74,000 | $35,000 | $38,500 | $42,350 | $46,585 |
| **Fundraising** | **$0** | **$18,000** | **$18,600** | **$20,460** | **$22,506** |
| Fundraising Events & Campaigns | $0 | $12,000 | $12,000 | $13,200 | $14,520 |
| Donor Database / Marketing | $0 | $6,000 | $6,600 | $7,260 | $7,986 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carry (from year before) | $0 | $10,300 | $31,900 | $0 | $0 |
| Revenue (from above) | $105,800 | $185,600 | $305,500 | $407,800 | $508,000 |
| Expenses (from above) | $95,500 | $164,000 | $365,200 | $448,890 | $457,218 |
| **Totals** | **$10,300** | **$31,900** | **-$27,800** | **-$41,090** | **$50,783** |

## Model B: Grants to Extend Pathways to Fee-focused Revenue

This financial model assumes outside grants (from HUD, AVDFs, etc.) will help in the first two (AVDFs) or three (HUD) years of launch.

It also assumes that a staff of ED, marketing professional, and admin start in the first year of the non-profits existence.

It illustrates that the accrediting body may charge accreditation fees (new, or renewal) to less than the break-even 25 institutions-per-year… providing healthy savings to shelter its path to positive revenue.

Statement of Activities B

| (HUD & AVDFs Grants, 3 staff start in 2026) | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Accredited Programs** | **0** | **3** | **9** | **24** | **42** |
| New Applications | 3 | 6 | 15 | 18 | 20 |
| Renewals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| **Revenue** | **$590,800** | **$559,100** | **$305,500** | **$407,800** | **$508,000** |
| **Earned Revenue** | **$42,300** | **$96,600** | **$247,500** | **$349,800** | **$450,000** |
| Accreditation Fees (application + annual dues) | $15,000 | $30,000 | $75,000 | $90,000 | $100,000 |
| Site Visit or Evaluation Fees | $12,000 | $24,000 | $60,000 | $72,000 | $80,000 |
| Training & Workshop Fees | $3,300 | $6,600 | $16,500 | $19,800 | $22,000 |
| Institutional Membership | $12,000 | $36,000 | $96,000 | $168,000 | $248,000 |
| **Contributed Revenue** | **$548,500** | **$462,500** | **$58,000** | **$58,000** | **$58,000** |
| Corporate Sponsorships | $15,000 | $22,000 | $24,000 | $25,000 | $25,000 |
| Individual Donations | $14,000 | $18,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 |
| Restricted Program Grants (e.g. to fund curriculum development) | $485,000 | $395,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 |
| Unrestricted Operating Grants | $19,500 | $12,500 | $5,000 | $5,000 | $5,000 |
| In-Kind Contributions | $15,000 | $15,000 | $9,000 | $8,000 | $8,000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Expenses** | **$95,500** | **$423,000** | **$442,200** | **$448,890** | **$457,218** |
| | | | | | |
| **Program** | **$19,000** | **$12,000** | **$26,000** | **$26,000** | **$27,000** |
| Consultant & Contract Services (Program) | $15,000 | $3,000 | $14,000 | $12,000 | $12,500 |
| Travel & Conferences (Program Delivery) | $4,000 | $9,000 | $12,000 | $14,000 | $14,500 |
| | | | | | |
| **Management & General Salaries** | **$76,500** | **$393,000** | **$397,600** | **$402,430** | **$407,712** |
| Salaries & Benefits | $343,000 | $343,000 | $343,000 | $343,000 | $343,000 |
| Administrative Rent & Utilities | $0 | $12,000 | $12,600 | $13,230 | $13,892 |
| Office Supplies & Equipment & IT | $2,500 | $3,000 | $3,500 | $3,850 | $4,235 |
| Professional Fees (Accounting, Legal) | $74,000 | $35,000 | $38,500 | $42,350 | $46,585 |
| | | | | | |
| **Fundraising** | **$0** | **$18,000** | **$18,600** | **$20,460** | **$22,506** |
| Fundraising Events & Campaigns | $0 | $12,000 | $12,000 | $13,200 | $14,520 |
| Donor Database / Marketing | $0 | $6,000 | $6,600 | $7,260 | $7,986 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carry (from year before) | $0 | $495,300 | $631,400 | $494,700 | $453,610 |
| Revenue (from above) | $590,800 | $559,100 | $305,500 | $407,800 | $508,000 |
| Expenses (from above) | $95,500 | $423,000 | $442,200 | $448,890 | $457,218 |
| **Totals** | **$495,300** | **$631,400** | **$494,700** | **$453,610** | **$504,393** |

## Model C: Bootstrapping to Partner-focused Revenue

This financial model assumes no significant outside grants, but that the accrediting body may charge collateral partnership fees to ensure revenue-positive position.

A 50-50 revenue model (between collateral partners and accreditation fees) appears to break-even at the accreditation rate of 15 institutions-per-year.

Like Model A, the ED arrives in the 2nd Year, and other staff in later succession.

Statement of Activities C

| (Collateral Partners, ED starts in 2nd Year) | 2026 | 2027 | 2028 | 2029 | 2030 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Accredited Programs** | **0** | **3** | **9** | **24** | **42** |
| New Applications | 3 | 6 | 15 | 18 | 20 |
| Renewals | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| **Revenue** | **$155,800** | **$240,600** | **$366,000** | **$474,350** | **$581,205** |
| **Earned Revenue** | **$42,300** | **$96,600** | **$247,500** | **$349,800** | **$450,000** |
| Accreditation Fees (application + annual dues) | $15,000 | $30,000 | $75,000 | $90,000 | $100,000 |
| Site Visit or Evaluation Fees | $12,000 | $24,000 | $60,000 | $72,000 | $80,000 |
| Training & Workshop Fees | $3,300 | $6,600 | $16,500 | $19,800 | $22,000 |
| Institutional Membership | $12,000 | $36,000 | $96,000 | $168,000 | $248,000 |
| **Contributed Revenue** | **$113,500** | **$144,000** | **$118,500** | **$124,550** | **$131,205** |
| Collateral Partnerships | $50,000 | $55,000 | $60,500 | $66,550 | $73,205 |
| Corporate Sponsorships | $15,000 | $22,000 | $24,000 | $25,000 | $25,000 |
| Individual Donations | $14,000 | $18,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 |
| Restricted Program Grants (e.g. to fund curriculum development) | $0 | $21,500 | $10,000 | $10,000 | $10,000 |
| Unrestricted Operating Grants | $19,500 | $12,500 | $5,000 | $5,000 | $5,000 |
| In-Kind Contributions | $15,000 | $15,000 | $9,000 | $8,000 | $8,000 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Expenses** | **$95,500** | **$164,000** | **$365,200** | **$448,890** | **$457,218** |
| **Program** | **$19,000** | **$12,000** | **$26,000** | **$26,000** | **$27,000** |
| Consultant & Contract Services (Program) | $15,000 | $3,000 | $14,000 | $12,000 | $12,500 |
| Travel & Conferences (Program Delivery) | $4,000 | $9,000 | $12,000 | $14,000 | $14,500 |
| **Management & General Salaries** | **$76,500** | **$134,000** | **$320,600** | **$402,430** | **$407,712** |
| Salaries & Benefits | $0 | $84,000 | $266,000 | $343,000 | $343,000 |
| Administrative Rent & Utilities | $0 | $12,000 | $12,600 | $13,230 | $13,892 |
| Office Supplies & Equipment & IT | $2,500 | $3,000 | $3,500 | $3,850 | $4,235 |
| Professional Fees (Accounting, Legal) | $74,000 | $35,000 | $38,500 | $42,350 | $46,585 |
| **Fundraising** | **$0** | **$18,000** | **$18,600** | **$20,460** | **$22,506** |
| Fundraising Events & Campaigns | $0 | $12,000 | $12,000 | $13,200 | $14,520 |
| Donor Database / Marketing | $0 | $6,000 | $6,600 | $7,260 | $7,986 |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Carry (from year before) | $0 | $60,300 | $136,900 | $137,700 | $163,160 |
| Revenue (from above) | $155,800 | $240,600 | $366,000 | $474,350 | $581,205 |
| Expenses (from above) | $95,500 | $164,000 | $365,200 | $448,890 | $457,218 |
| **Totals** | **$60,300** | **$136,900** | **$137,700** | **$163,160** | **$287,148** |

## Appendix 05: The CfOC's Applications for Related Grants.

During the administration of this Task Force, the CfOC staff advanced two grants to fund a future accrediting body – should the MBI & CfOC leadership agree the endeavor is worth pursuing.

### HUD 2025 Grant Application (FR-6900-N-92)

HUD FY2025 Notice of Funding Opportunity (NOFO) for "Advancing Building Technology Grant Program"

Application titled *"Establishing the Nation's First Accreditation Body for Offsite Construction Degree Programs"* was accepted July 24, 2025. The requested amount was **$847,950**.

See the full application, here. See CfOC messaging about the application here.

### Arthur Vining Davis Foundations Grant Application

LOI entitled "*Providing Private Higher Education Curricula for Offsite Construction Degree Programs, to Level the Playing Field with Polytechnical Institutes*" was accepted August 07, 2025. The requested amount was **$300,000**.

NB: Most programs are pre-screened before the AVDF agrees to engage a Letter of Intent. The CfOC made it through the pre-screen process and submitted the LOI before the August 30th yearly deadline.

See the full LOI, here.