



# **Canberra Accord**

# Rules and Procedures

Approved April 23, 2009  
Effective April 23, 2009  
First Revision (2014)

# **RULES AND PROCEDURES**

## **Table of Contents**

**Introduction .....Error! Bookmark not defined.**

**1.0 Characteristics, Principles, and Criteria Common to all Signatory Systems ..... 6**

**1.1 General characteristics ..... 6**

**1.2 Common agreed principles ..... 6**

**1.3 Criteria for accreditation..... 6**

**1.4 INQAAHE *Guidelines of Good Practice (GGP)*..... 7**

**1.5 UNESCO-UIA *Charter for Architectural Education*..... 8**

**2.0 Review Processes ..... 10**

**2.1 Periodic Reviews of Signatory Systems ..... 10**

a. Periodic review process and timetable ..... 10

b. Reviewers and their responsibilities..... 10

c. Periodic review documentation ..... 11

d. Periodic review visit..... 12

e. Periodic review report..... 12

f. Possible outcomes of periodic reviews..... 12

g. Requests for reconsideration ..... 13

h. Costs ..... 15

**2.2 Application Process for Signatory Status**

a. Applying for provisional status ..... 15

b. Initial documentation..... 16

c. Provisional status review visit and documentation..... 17

d. Provisional status review team and its responsibilities ..... 17

e. Provisional review report..... 18

f. Possible outcomes of provisional status reviews ..... 18

g. Requests for reconsideration ..... 18

h. Costs .....	18
i. Participation during provisional status period .....	18
j. Transfer to signatory status .....	19
<b>2.3 Mentoring New Systems .....</b>	<b>19</b>
a. Advisory reviews .....	19
b. Secretariat advice .....	19
c. Advisory review report .....	20
d. Visit to observe a signatory system .....	20
e. Costs .....	20
<b>2.4 Review Teams .....</b>	<b>20</b>
a. Nominating and selecting reviewers .....	20
b. Composition of review teams .....	21
<b>2.5 Report Policies and Templates.....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>3.0 General Meetings.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>4.0 Chair .....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>5.0 Secretariat.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>6.0 Communications and Promotion of the Accord .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: Schedule of First Round of Periodic Reviews .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: Periodic Review Report Template .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: Provisional Review Report Template.....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: Advisory Review Report Template .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>APPENDIX E: Characteristics, Principles, and Criteria for Assessing Substantial Equivalency .....</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>APPENDIX F: Accepted Definitions/Glossary of Terms .....</b>	<b>61</b>

## **RULES AND PROCEDURES**

The terms 'accreditation', 'validation' and 'recognition' are used in different domains and contexts to describe a quality assurance process or system. They have different shades of meaning although are sometimes used interchangeably. Despite the semantic differences, for ease of reading, the single word 'accreditation' will generally be used hereon to embrace all three terms (in place of 'accreditation', 'validation' and 'recognition' as used throughout the First Edition (April 2009) of the *Rules and Procedures*).

In the 2009 edition, 'program' was written to indicate the two versions of spelling used by different signatories to the Accord. In this First Revision of the *Rules and Procedures* (xxxx 2014), the spelling will be shown simply as 'program', again, for ease of reading but also recognizing that this is the spelling used by the majority of existing signatories.

### **Introduction**

Accreditation is a quality assurance mechanism to recognize those programs in which graduates acquire certain competencies. The signatory systems to the Canberra Accord have concluded that their accreditation systems for academic programs in architecture have comparability and that such programs are substantially equivalent in terms of satisfying the academic requirements for the practice of architecture at the professional level. The signatory systems to the Canberra Accord operate within internationally accepted guidelines for good practice. Graduates with qualifications from accredited programs in architecture recognized by the Canberra Accord are expected to have commonly held attributes including the ability to:

1. apply the acquired knowledge for the design, operation, and improvement of systems, processes, and environments;
2. formulate and solve complex architectural problems;
3. understand and resolve the environmental, economic, and societal implications of architectural work;
4. communicate effectively with clients, peers, and community;
5. engage in lifelong learning and professional development following graduation;
6. act in accordance with the ethical principles of the profession of architecture;
7. make the case publicly for better human environments in contemporary society.

The Accord embraces the key principles of the International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education (INQAAHE) *Guidelines of Good Practice* (GGP) (revised edition 2006) as its benchmark for international good practice for quality assurance agencies (see summary at 1.4 below); and is reflective of the core

principles of the UNESCO-UIA *Charter for Architectural Education* (revised version 2011) (see 1.5 below) and the relevant sections of the UIA *Accord on Recommended International Standards on Professionalism in Architectural Practice* (third edition December 2006) as international benchmarks for satisfying the academic requirements for the practice of architecture at the professional level.

## **1.0 Characteristics, Principles, and Criteria Common to all Signatory Systems**

### **1.1 General characteristics**

Canberra Accord signatory systems are expected to have the following general characteristics:

- a. be named organizations (authorities, agencies, or institutions) that are representative of the architecture profession and which have statutory powers or recognized professional authority for accrediting, validating or recognizing programs designed to satisfy the academic requirements for admission to the profession in the locality where accreditation, validation or recognition takes place, subject to additional requirements imposed by local regulations and practice requirements;
- b. be independent of the academic institutions, professional organizations, and government agencies delivering accredited programs within their jurisdiction;
- c. have an active, robust accreditation system in place, with established processes, procedures, and practices that are well-documented;
- d. have a record of accomplishment in accreditation with sufficient experience and magnitude of operation (normally a minimum of five successful accreditation visits over at least seven years; see 2.2.a).

### **1.2 Common agreed principles**

Systems for the accreditation of architecture programs shall be underpinned by common agreed principles including:

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

### **1.3 Criteria for accreditation**

The criteria for accreditation should address the following:

- a. a suitable environment to deliver the program;
- b. adequate leadership for the program;
- c. a suitable team of qualified people teaching in the program;
- d. a curriculum providing a broad preparation for architectural practice;

- e. appropriate entry, progression, and exit standards;
  - f. adequate human, physical, financial, and information resources to support the program;
- and shall include:
- g. periodic re-evaluation to maintain accreditation status;
  - h. a period of academic study at, or in association with a university/tertiary-level institution sufficient to demonstrate skills, abilities, attitudes, and knowledge at a defined standard adequate for initial entry to the architecture profession. In order to gain the balanced acquisition of subjects and capabilities, this period of academic study should be normally not less than the equivalent of five years full-time studies.

#### **1.4 INQAAHE *Guidelines of Good Practice (GPP)***

As external quality assurance agencies (EQAA), signatory systems should embrace the key principles of the *Guidelines of Good Practice* (Revised edition 2006) published by INQAAHE. These are summarized as follows.

The EQAA:

- a. has a written mission statement or set of objectives that takes into account its cultural and historical context;
- b. has adequate and accessible human and financial resources to conduct external evaluation effectively and efficiently in accordance with its mission statement and its methodological approach;
- c. has a system of continuous quality assurance of its own activities that emphasizes flexibility in response to the changing nature of higher education, the effectiveness of its operations, and its contribution towards the achievement of its objectives;
- d. informs and responds to the public in accordance with applicable legislation and the cultural context of the EQAA;
- e. recognizes that institutional and programmatic quality and quality assurance are primarily the responsibility of the higher education institutions themselves; respects the academic autonomy, identity and integrity of the institutions or programs; applies standards or criteria that have been subject to reasonable consultation with stakeholders; and aims to contribute to both quality improvement and accountability of the institution;
- f. has documents that indicate clearly what the EQAA expects of the institution;
- g. has documentation concerning self-evaluation which explains the purposes, procedures, process, and expectations in the self-evaluation process. The documents also include the standards used, the decision criteria, the reporting format, and other information needed by the higher education institution;
- h. has clear documentation concerning the external evaluation that states the standards used, assessment methods and processes, decision criteria, and other information necessary for external review;
- i. evaluations address both the higher education institution's own self-assessment and external reference points, such as judgments by knowledgeable peers or relevant legislation;
- j. has appropriate methods and policies for appeals;
- k. collaborates with other EQAAs, if possible, in areas such as exchange of good practices, capacity building, review of decisions, provision of transnational education, joint projects, and staff exchanges;

- l. has policies relating to both imported and exported higher education.

### **1.5 UNESCO-UIA *Charter for Architectural Education***

In any system of accreditation it is of prime importance to establish the standards of achievement to be attained and the means of assessment through peer group review. Of equal importance is the need to encourage diversity, innovation, and development. This balance between benchmarking appropriate international standards and encouraging a variety of approaches are central to the principles of the Accord. To this end, signatory systems are expected to be reflective of the core principles of the UNESCO-UIA *Charter for Architectural Education*. In particular, signatory systems should ensure the acquisition of generic student skills, knowledge, and competencies including the following, identified in the *UNESCO-UIA Charter*:

- a. ability to create architectural designs that satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements.
- b. adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies, and human sciences.
- c. knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design.
- d. adequate knowledge of urban design, planning, and the skills involved in the planning process.
- e. understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and of the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale.
- f. understanding of the profession of architecture and the role of the architect in society, in particular in preparing briefs that take into account social factors.
- g. understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project.
- h. understanding of the structural design, constructional, and engineering problems associated with building design.
- i. adequate knowledge of physical problems and technologies and of the function of buildings so as to provide them with internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate.
- j. design skills necessary to meet building users' requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations.
- k. adequate knowledge of the industries, organisations, regulations, and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into overall planning.

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

- l. awareness of responsibilities toward human, social, cultural, urban, architectural, and environmental values, as well as architectural heritage.
- m. adequate knowledge of the means of achieving ecologically sustainable design and environmental conservation and rehabilitation.
- n. development of a creative competence in building techniques, founded on a comprehensive understanding of the disciplines and construction methods related to architecture.

- o. adequate knowledge of project financing, project management, cost control, and methods of project delivery.
- p. training in research techniques as an inherent part of architectural learning, for both students and teachers.

## 2.0 Review Processes

### 2.1 Periodic Reviews of Signatory Systems

The purpose of the periodic review is to ensure that the signatory systems maintain the characteristics, principles and criteria set forth in 1.0 above and other requirements stated in these Rules and Procedures. The periodic comprehensive review and report by representatives of the other signatory systems at intervals of not more than six years. The Accord Secretariat shall maintain a schedule and set of procedures for the implementation of such reviews and reports, including a description of the documentation and self assessment required for the review team visit. The adoption of, or amendment to, the schedule and procedures, shall require a positive vote by at least two-thirds of the signatory systems. The signatory systems shall make every reasonable effort to comply with the schedule and documentation requirements.

#### a. Periodic review process and timetable

The signatory system to be reviewed shall be given at least nine months' notice of the intended action, and shall be invited to work with the Secretariat to establish a suitable implementation of the process, timetable, and practical arrangements, for consideration by the review team. The review process shall include observing an accreditation visit to an educational institution offering a professional degree program in architecture that has been accredited, validated or recognized by the signatory system, and, whenever feasible, attending the meetings at which the outcomes of such a visit are discussed and recommended. The review process should allow the review team sufficient opportunity to observe the normal processes and procedures of the accreditation system being reviewed, with access to related documentation, in order to enable an understanding of how academic outcomes and standards are evaluated.

The proposed schedule for the second round of periodic reviews is shown at Appendix A.

Any signatory system that effects a significant change to its accreditation criteria, policies, or procedures is obliged to report such a change to the Accord Secretariat and thereby to provide the other signatory systems with the opportunity to require that the scheduled review and report be brought forward.

#### b. Reviewers and their responsibilities

All periodic reviews of signatory systems will be conducted by two people representing the Accord (one educator and one practitioner) and a local facilitator nominated by the signatory system to be visited and acceptable to the Accord. Reviewers must be fluent in English. The facilitator must be fluent in both English and the local language. A report to be submitted for the review of all signatory systems will be written by the representatives of the Accord with an opportunity for the system visited to review it for errors of fact.

The signatory system responsible for the accreditation system to be reviewed shall be advised by the Accord Secretariat of the qualifications of the reviewers. The signatory system may challenge no more than one proposed reviewer on the basis of a conflict of interest (see below). In the event that such an objection is lodged, the Accord Secretariat shall take such steps as are necessary and appropriate to resolve the situation.

Conflicts of interest are defined to include the following:

1. graduation from an institution with a degree accredited by the system being visited;
2. close association with administrative or faculty personnel in a program accredited by the system being visited;
3. having had a position associated with the system being visited (e.g., part-time teaching, external examiner, studio critic, etc.);
4. having relatives or associates who are affiliated with a program accredited by the system being visited;
5. having been shown to hold a preconceived opinion based on the type or location of the system to be reviewed, its reputation, the underlying philosophy of the system, or the extent to which programs accredited by the signatory system are offered at the undergraduate or graduate level, and so on.

c. Periodic review documentation

Periodic reviews of signatory systems will include an evaluation of the following documentation:

1. a self-evaluation by the signatory system that documents the system's adherence to the Characteristics, Principles and Criteria of the Accord identified in section 1.0 of these Rules and Procedures; reviews recent changes as well as challenges to the system (legal or otherwise) and the signatory system's response to the challenges; and identifies critical issues for the system in the near future (1-5 years).
2. current and relevant documents describing the criteria, policies, and procedures of the system to be reviewed. Types of documents that can be offered as evidence that the system continues to comply with Canberra Accord criteria would include arrangements for visits, selection and training of visiting teams, ratification processes, etc.

All official documentation and communication directly relevant to the Canberra Accord reviews must be in English.

The total file, including the self-evaluation, described in paragraph c.1, and supplemental materials must conform to a format provided by the Secretariat.

d. Periodic review visit

The reviewers and the local facilitator will accompany a visiting team from the host signatory system as it reviews a program accredited by its system. The host signatory system must demonstrate with exhibits of student work available to the reviewers from the Accord that the level and content of studies of its accredited programs continue to be substantially equivalent to those of the current signatory systems.

Both reviewers and the facilitator will visit the administrative office for the signatory system and review its procedures, and, should be provided access to minutes of meetings in which accreditation decisions are made.

e. Periodic review report

Reports written by the Accord reviewers will follow a template (see Appendix B), appropriate to the type of visit, which will be provided by the Secretariat. Each review team will make a confidential recommendation to the members of the Accord based upon the team's review of the documents submitted and their observations on the visit.

The report should be submitted to the Accord Secretariat within one month of the end of the visit. The Secretariat will review the document (without the confidential recommendation), with the advice of the signatory system visited, for corrections of errors of fact and then submit the report to the signatory systems of the Accord.

f. Possible outcomes of periodic reviews

The recommendations open to the review team shall be as follows:

1. that the accreditation system in question be accepted by the other signatory systems, for a period of six years, as leading to outcomes substantially equivalent to those from the other systems; or
2. that the accreditation system in question be accepted by the other signatory systems, for a period of not more than three years, subject to the responsible system providing, within six months, a report which satisfies to the other signatory systems that adequate steps are being taken to address the specific deficiencies or concerns identified by the review team; or
3. that the accreditation system in question has such serious deficiencies with respect to the characteristics, principles, and/or criteria required of signatory systems (see Section 1.0), that the signatory reverts immediately to provisional status. In such circumstances, a further review visit is arranged, involving at least one of the original reviewers, within a period of not more than two years after the date of the original review visit. On the basis of this follow-up visit, the review team shall recommend to the other signatories either (i) reinstatement of the signatory system from provisional to signatory status, or (ii) termination of provisional status and exclusion from the Accord.

A motion for termination from the Accord shall require support from two-thirds of the signatory systems. No such termination shall, of itself, affect the status of the academic qualifications gained by any graduate who has completed the professional degree program in architecture prior to that termination. A decision to terminate a system's membership in the Accord shall require an affirmative, unanimous vote, less one, by the signatory systems.

Following a period of two years the terminated signatory system may reapply for provisional status.

Decisions on recommendations from the reviewers are made by all signatories to the Accord except the one that is the subject of the recommendations. Votes may be taken by voice or teleconference, email, or in face-to-face meetings. In all cases, these votes will be coordinated by the Accord Secretariat. The decision shall be communicated to the reviewed signatory system as one reached by consensus.

g. Requests for reconsideration

A signatory system may request reconsideration of an action regarding a review visit. When making a request for reconsideration, the signatory system must be prepared to present evidence that demonstrates either of the following is true:

- the decision is not supported by factual evidence cited in the record or
- the review team failed to comply substantially with established rules and procedures and any such departure significantly affected the decision.

Reconsiderations may not be requested on the grounds of the failure of the signatory system to provide information to the Secretariat and/or the review team in a timely manner.

Reconsiderations are conducted by the full membership of the Accord. The filing of a request for a reconsideration automatically delays implementation of the review decision. All reconsiderations are conducted on the record and without a hearing.

1. Initiating a reconsideration:
  - a. The reconsideration must be requested by the chief executive officer of the signatory system within 30 calendar days of receiving the Accord's review decision.
  - b. The request is sent to the Accord Secretariat.
  - c. The request must identify the incorrect or insufficient factual
  - d. information cited by the Accord in support of the decision and/or evidence of the review team's failure to comply with established rules and procedures and that such failure significantly affected the review decision.
  - e. The request must be sent by email to the Accord Secretariat.
  - f. All days refer to regular calendar days.

2. Reconsideration sequence.
  - a. Upon receiving the request, the Secretariat appoints an individual from a signatory system, not represented on the review team, as the Accord representative to oversee the reconsideration until its conclusion at the next regularly scheduled, General Meeting. Other than having participated in the review decision, the signatory representative shall have had no prior involvement with the signatory system.
  - b. The Accord representative sends the request for reconsideration to the review team and requests a written response to the assertions of incorrect or insufficient evidence and/or failures of the review team to comply with established procedures.
  - c. The Accord representative, using the Periodic Review Report, the signatory system's self-evaluation, the system's request for reconsideration, and the review team's response, shall prepare a written analysis of the issues.
  - d. The written analysis is sent to the signatory system and the review team and then the request for reconsideration is added to the agenda for the next regularly scheduled meeting or for a special teleconference meeting.
    - i. The agenda item will include the following background material:
      1. The Periodic Review Report.
      2. The signatory system's self-evaluation.
      3. The signatory system's request for reconsideration.
      4. The review team's response.
      5. The Accord representative's analysis.
    - ii. If a member of the review team is a signatory system representative, he/she is excused from the deliberations.
    - iii. The signatory system representatives review the record and determine whether to reconsider the review decision. At least a majority of members of the Accord must vote in favor of a motion to reconsider the decision.
    - iv. Reconsideration of the review decision.
      1. If the motion to reconsider is approved, a new motion on the review action will be made.
      2. Any new motion regarding the review decision must be based only on materials provided in the record.
      3. Any new motion regarding a reconsidered review decision must have an affirmative unanimous vote, less one, in favor to pass.
    - v. Not less than seven calendar days after the meeting where the membership decision was reconsidered, the Accord Secretariat shall send the signatory system the decision. This letter will include reasons supporting it as recorded by the Accord representative.

vi. The decision is final and may not be reconsidered further.

h. Costs

All costs, except transportation from the reviewer's home country to the site of the visit, will be borne by the signatory system to be visited. Transportation to the site will be the responsibility of the signatory system providing the reviewer. Costs for the signatory system being visited will include local travel and boarding accommodations.

## **2.2 Application Process for Signatory Status**

a. Applying for provisional status

Admission of new signatory systems to the Accord is a two-stage process:

1. Stage 1: applying for and being accepted for provisional status following a successful desktop review of the applicant system.
2. Stage 2: transfer from provisional to signatory status following a review visit evaluation resulting in a positive recommendation for transfer of status (see 2.2.j below).

A successful admission to provisional status requires:

3. An application by letter for provisional status supported by nominations from two of the existing signatory systems.
4. An affirmative unanimous vote, less one, by the existing signatory systems following a successful desktop review of the applicant system by the Accord Secretariat.

Applications for provisional status must conform to the guidelines approved from time-to-time by the signatory systems and must be submitted in writing to the Secretariat, supported by nominations from at least two signatory systems. Prior to making the application, applicants will be required to observe an accreditation visit conducted by one of the existing signatory systems.

Organizations seeking provisional status must provide evidence that their processes, policies, and procedures for granting accreditation, validation or recognition to academic programs in architecture adhere to the Characteristics, Principles and Criteria of the Accord identified in section 1.0 of these Rules and Procedures. An applicant agency with provisional status must have achieved a record of accomplishment in accreditation with sufficient experience and magnitude of operation (generally a minimum of five programs over at least seven years) before being reviewed for full membership in the Accord.

During the period of provisional status (normally two years), the accreditation criteria, policies, and procedures established by the applicant agency, and the effectiveness with which they are implemented, are subject to comprehensive review.

The applicant agency whose accreditation system is to be reviewed shall be given at least nine months notice of the intended action, and shall be invited to work with the Secretariat to implement a suitable process, timetable, and practical arrangements, for consideration by the review team. The review process shall include observing an accreditation visit to one educational institution offering a professional degree program in architecture that has been accredited by the applicant, and, whenever feasible, attending the meetings at which the outcomes of such a visit are discussed and recommended. The review process should allow the review team sufficient opportunity to observe the normal processes and procedures of the accreditation system being reviewed, with access to related documentation, and enable an understanding of how academic outcomes and standards are evaluated, in order to ascertain whether the applicant's system complies with the characteristics, principles, and criteria required of signatory systems of the Accord. (see section 1.0)

b. Initial documentation

Preliminary reviews of systems seeking provisional status will include a desktop evaluation by the Accord Secretariat of the following documentation:

Existing self-evaluations; strategic planning documents; conditions, criteria, and procedures currently in use; a history of the development of the system; and an analysis of the degree to which the system meets the principles of the Accord identified in section 1.0 of these Rules and Procedures (see Appendix E).

All official documentation and communication directly relevant to the Canberra Accord reviews must be in English.

The applicant must demonstrate that robust processes and documentation are in place for the judicious operation of the accreditation system, substantially equivalent to those of current signatory systems.

The application for provisional status and reports must be submitted to the Secretariat of the Accord at least 18 weeks prior to the next General Meeting of signatory systems. The standard format for the application will be provided by the Secretariat.

The precise nature of the application documentation may be agreed in consultation with the Secretariat. Wherever possible, existing standard documents may be used as long as they describe in sufficient detail the accreditation procedures, policies, and criteria of the applicant, the context within which the operation takes place, and a list of current programs accredited.

### c. Provisional status review visit and documentation

During the period of provisional status (normally two years), the accreditation criteria, policies, and procedures established by the applicant, and the effectiveness with which they are implemented, are subject to comprehensive review. The review shall follow the same general procedures used in periodic reviews for monitoring the performance of signatory systems.

A review team will accompany a visiting team from the applicant system as it reviews a program accredited by its system. The applicant system must demonstrate with exhibits of student work available to the reviewers from the Accord that the level and content of studies of its accredited programs are substantially equivalent to those of current signatory systems.

Both reviewers and the facilitator will visit the administrative office for the system and review its procedures and should be provided access to minutes of meetings in which accreditation decisions are made.

Reviews of the systems of organizations holding provisional status, applying for signatory status, will include evaluation of the following documentation and review visit by a team of two (one educator, one practitioner):

1. A self-study by the applicant that documents the system's adherence to the Characteristics, Principles and Criteria of the Accord identified in section 1.0 of these Rules and Procedures; reviews recent challenges to the system (legal or otherwise) and the system's response to the challenges; and identifies critical issues for the system in the near future (1-5 years).
2. Current and relevant documentation describing the criteria, policies, and procedures of the system to be reviewed. Types of documents that might be offered as evidence that the system complies with Canberra Accord criteria would include arrangements for visits, selection and training of visiting teams, ratification processes, etc.

### d. Provisional status review team and its responsibilities

The review for initial acceptance as a signatory system will be conducted by a team of two persons representing the Accord (one educator and one practitioner) and a local facilitator, nominated by the system to be visited and acceptable to the Accord. The facilitator must be fluent in both English and the local language. The reviewers from the Accord will accompany a team from the host system as it reviews a program accredited by its system. Both reviewers and the facilitator will visit the administrative office for the system and review its procedures.

A report to be submitted for the review of all signatory systems will be written by the representatives of the Accord with an opportunity for the system visited to review it for errors of fact.

The system to be reviewed shall be advised by the Secretariat of the proposed composition of the review team. The system may challenge no

more than one proposed reviewer on the basis of a conflict of interest (see section 2.1.b). In the event that such an objection is lodged, the Secretariat shall take such steps as are necessary and appropriate to resolve the situation.

e. Provisional review report

Reports written by the Accord review team will follow a template (see Appendix C), appropriate to the type of visit, which will be provided by the Accord Secretariat. Each review team will make a confidential recommendation to the signatory systems based upon its evaluation of the documents submitted and observations on the visit. The report will be sent to the Secretariat.

The Secretariat will review the document (without the confidential recommendation), with the advice of the system visited, for corrections of errors of fact and then submit the report to the signatory systems of the Accord.

f. Possible outcomes of provisional status reviews

The recommendations open to the review team shall be as follows:

1. That the accreditation system being reviewed should be accepted by the other signatory systems as leading to outcomes substantially equivalent to those of existing signatory systems, and that the system be transferred from provisional to signatory status for a period of six years.
2. That the accreditation system being reviewed should not be accepted by the signatory systems as being substantially equivalent to the existing signatory systems and that the system should continue to have provisional status for a further period of two years.
3. Where transfer to signatory status is not recommended, details should be provided of the actions required by the system before it will be considered for further review by the Accord.

g. Requests for reconsideration

[See 2.1.g]

h. Costs

All costs will be borne by the system to be visited. Costs for the system being visited will include all travel (based on the practices of the system to be visited) and boarding accommodations.

i. Participation during provisional status period

Organizations holding provisional status are required to accept the same commitment to interaction and exchange as the signatory systems. They will

receive copies of appropriate correspondence and reports, and will be invited to send representatives to all general meetings of the Accord. Representatives of organizations holding provisional status will have the right of audience and debate at such general meetings, but are not permitted to vote.

j. Transfer to signatory status

Decisions on the transfer to signatory status are made by all members of the Accord. Votes may be taken by voice or teleconference, email, or in face-to-face meetings. In all cases, these votes will be coordinated by the Secretariat. The decision shall be communicated to the reviewed signatory system as one reached by consensus.

Where such transfer of status is approved, the recommended recognition by the other signatory systems of the substantial equivalency of the academic qualifications/programs concerned shall become effective 1 January in the year in which the new signatory system is admitted to signatory status.

Where transfer from provisional status to signatory status is not approved, but significant progress has been made towards meeting the requirements, the signatory systems may, following a two-thirds positive vote, invite the organization concerned to retain provisional status for a further period of two years. Any such resolution must be accompanied by a statement of the requirements to be satisfied by the relevant organization during that period, and a schedule for completion.

## **2.3 Mentoring New Systems**

Organizations seeking to develop a new accreditation system or with a nascent system may apply for mentoring and advice from the Secretariat and/or signatory systems to the Accord. Organizations may make connections with any of the agencies represented in the Accord for informal mentoring.

a. Advisory reviews

Organizations may request an advisory review by applying through the Secretariat for an expert from the Accord pool of reviewers to visit the applying agency, review appropriate documents, and write a report on its current compliance with respect to the conditions required for provisional and signatory status. This reviewer from the Accord should be teamed with a facilitator, competent in the local language and in English, chosen by the system and acceptable to the Accord. Such a visit is optional and is not a prerequisite for eligibility to apply for provisional status. All related costs will be borne by the system to be visited, seeking advice.

b. Secretariat advice

Organizations may request Secretariat staff to visit their system to explain the rules, procedures, and conditions required for application for provisional and/or signatory status. Such a visit is optional and not a prerequisite for eligibility to apply for provisional status. All related costs will be borne by the system to be visited, seeking advice.

c. Advisory review report

The outcome of an advisory visit and review is a report (see Appendix D for template) written by the reviewers and/or Secretariat staff for the use of the system visited. The report will describe the degree to which the necessary conditions for provisional/signatory status have been demonstrated. Such reports are advisory in nature and not a prerequisite for eligibility to apply for provisional status; however, the organization being reviewed can opt to use the report in a future application for provisional status, in which case the report would be circulated to existing signatory systems for information.

d. Visit to observe a signatory system

Organizations intending to apply to the Accord for provisional status, should send a representative at least once to observe an accreditation visit conducted by one of the signatory systems. Arrangements should be made directly between the two systems involved. Such a visit is a prerequisite for eligibility in applying for provisional status. All related costs will be borne by the system seeking provisional status.

e. Costs

All costs incurred by a reviewer and the Accord Secretariat in providing advice and/or an advisory visit, including staff time and Secretariat expenses, will be borne by the system seeking advice. The Secretariat will provide an estimate of such costs in advance of undertaking advisory work.

## **2.4 Review Teams**

a. Nominating and selecting reviewers

Upon receipt of a written request from the Accord Secretariat, each signatory system shall nominate two representatives, one from an academic background and one from a professional practice background, who are available to observe and report upon the accreditation system maintained by any other signatory system, or organization seeking provisional/signatory status, and undertake to meet the costs of long distance travel incurred by those representatives.

All those nominated to take part in a review will be required to demonstrate that they have experience in, and subject knowledge relevant to, architectural accreditation systems. Nominees should be fluent in English for oral and written communications in the review process. In order to maintain clear lines of responsibility for actions, systems should not list nominees responsible for voting on Accord decisions for their system. No signatory system shall be required by this clause to provide more than one such representative in any calendar year.

Representatives shall be selected by the Accord Secretariat from the list of nominees to form a review team; on any two-person team at least one representative shall be from an academic background and one from a

professional practice background. The Secretariat shall take all reasonable steps to ensure that none of the individuals selected through this process has had any substantial prior involvement in, or commitment to the accreditation system being reviewed.

## b. Composition of review teams

### 1. Periodic reviews

Periodic reviews of signatory systems shall be conducted by two people representing the Accord (one educator and one practitioner), with the aid of a local facilitator nominated by the system to be visited and acceptable to the Accord. The facilitator must be fluent in both English and the local language. The role of the facilitator is to assist the Accord representatives locally and observe the process, as appropriate, but shall not take part in formulating the outcome of the review.

### 2. Provisional status reviews

Reviews of systems holding provisional status shall be conducted by a team of two people representing the Accord (one educator and one practitioner), with the aid of a local facilitator, nominated by the system to be visited and acceptable to the Accord. The facilitator must be fluent in both English and the local language. The role of the facilitator is to assist the Accord representatives locally and observe the process, as appropriate, but shall not take part in formulating the outcome of the review.

### 3. Advisory reviews

Optional advisory reviews shall be conducted by one person drawn from the Accord pool of experts and a local facilitator nominated by the system to be visited and acceptable to the Accord. The facilitator must be fluent in both English and the local language. The role of the facilitator is to assist the Accord representatives locally and observe the process, as appropriate, but shall not take part in formulating the outcome of the review.

## 2.5 Report Policies and Templates

All discussions concerning a review undertaken in accordance with these Rules and Procedures shall be held in confidence. At the conclusion of each review, the review team shall forward its report and recommendations to the Secretariat as soon as reasonably practicable and no later than sixty (60) days after the completion of the review visit. Report templates are shown at Appendices B-D.

### a. Periodic and provisional status reviews

Following a periodic review or a provisional status review the recommendation of the team is to be reported only to the signatory systems, not to the system visited.

A copy of the report and recommendation shall be furnished to each signatory system through the Secretariat.

An affirmative unanimous vote, less one of the signatory systems is required to ratify the recommendations of the review team.

### b. Advisory reviews

Following an advisory review, the report is furnished to the system visited, not the signatory systems. If at a later date an applicant opts to use the advisory visit report as part of the evidence presented when applying for provisional status, then the report will be circulated by the Secretariat to the signatory systems.

### **3.0 General Meetings**

A General Meeting of representatives of the signatory systems shall normally be held at least every two years at a time and place selected by the Accord Secretariat, or by teleconference, following appropriate consultation with the signatory systems. Items for discussion at a General Meeting should be submitted to the Secretariat at least two months prior to the meeting, and the agenda and business papers should normally be distributed to the signatory systems at least one month prior to the meeting.

When agreement has been made to meet face-to-face, the time and place of the General Meeting shall, so far as practicable, be such as to minimize overall travel costs and carbon footprint for those representing the signatory systems. Where convenient, the General Meeting may be arranged to follow or precede a major international conference or similar event.

Each signatory system will arrange for at least one representative and a maximum of three, to attend the General Meeting. At a General Meeting, each signatory system shall have one vote on any voting decision, which should be exercised by one nominated representative. Signatory systems should recognize that substantive votes will be taken at the general meetings and authorize their delegate to represent the interests of their system. A simple majority will suffice for a decision on any matter, unless otherwise specified in the Accord or in these *Rules and Procedures*.

In the interests of continuity and consistency, signatory systems are expected to nominate at least one representative who will attend at least three consecutive General Meetings, rather than sending different individuals to each meeting.

When a General Meeting is to be hosted by a signatory system, arrangements for the meeting will be agreed between the Secretariat and the host organization. The cost of long-distance travel and local accommodation for representatives attending the General Meeting shall be borne by the relevant representatives' organizations; the main costs of hosting the meeting (local travel, meeting rooms, related refreshments, administrative support, and other incidental expenditures) shall be borne normally by the host agency.

#### **4.0 Chair**

At the conclusion of each General Meeting, a signatory system shall be appointed by the signatory systems to provide the Chair, and the person nominated by that system shall hold office until the conclusion of the next succeeding General Meeting. No system that has nominated the Chair for one period between General Meetings shall be responsible for nominating the Chair for the next such period.

The role of the Chair is to lead the General Meeting and to ensure the business of the meeting is dealt with in accordance with the Accord and the *Rules and Procedures*. Between General Meetings, the Chair will act as a point of contact and sounding board for the Secretariat and others, for the proper running of the Accord.

In all circumstances, when the Chair is also acting as the representative of one of the signatory systems, he/she shall be entitled to one vote only and is not entitled to an additional casting vote, should there be a split vote on any matter. The Chair is only entitled to vote if s/he is representing a signatory system with voting rights.

## 5.0 Secretariat

In order to administer the business of the Accord, day-to-day administration is undertaken by a Secretariat. Such a Secretariat shall be provided by one of the signatories to the Accord, with the endorsement of a majority vote by other signatories taken at a General Meeting. The appointment shall be made to a system that has a mandate to take on the role and can show that it has access to adequate resources to fulfill the functions of the Accord Secretariat effectively. An initial appointment shall be for a minimum period of four years. After four years, at the end of the General Meeting, the signatory systems shall decide, on the basis of majority vote, whether to renew the appointment of the same signatory system to provide the Secretariat for a further period of two years, renewable every two years, for up to a maximum of twelve years.

When there is a change to the signatory system appointed to provide the Secretariat, the appointment shall be as above, that is, for an initial period of four years, renewable every two years by majority agreement of signatory systems at the General Meeting, up to a maximum period of twelve years.

The Chair and the Secretariat may come from the same or different signatory systems.

The Secretariat shall be responsible for the following activities in support of the Accord:

1. Facilitate meetings including General Conference Calls and General Meetings.
2. Maintain a record of the deliberations and decisions at Conference Call Meetings and General Meetings.
3. Facilitate and record exchanges of information between the signatory systems.
4. Maintain the Accord website.
5. Undertake periodic evaluations and analyses of the conditions, criteria, and procedures used by each signatory system.
6. Undertake periodic analyses of the effect of the Accord on the profession within signatory systems.
7. Advise signatory systems and others as to the policies and procedures to be adopted to give effect to the terms of the Accord.
8. Advocacy and promotion of the Accord for the recognition, by regulators of architects, of the professional degree qualifications covered by the Accord.
9. Facilitate the process of new accreditation systems applying for provisional status within the Accord and proceeding to signatory status.

Arrangements for financial support by the signatory systems for the Secretariat shall be agreed at each General Meeting.

At the conclusion of the First General Meeting in Canberra (April 2008), on the basis of a majority vote, the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), based in Washington, DC, USA, was appointed by the signatory systems to provide the Secretariat to the Accord until December 2012. At the Third and Fourth General Meetings in Beijing (May 2011) and Guadalajara (May 2013), the appointment of the

NAAB to run the Accord was successively renewed, effective until 31 December, 2016.

## **6.0 Communications and Promotion of the Accord**

The Secretariat shall be responsible for maintaining an Accord website. This website shall provide all current Accord documentation; details of signatory systems; an up-to date list of all professional degrees currently accredited by signatory systems and recognized by the Accord; contact details; and any other relevant information and web-links deemed appropriate from time-to-time.

The normal method of communication between signatory systems and the Secretariat shall be by electronic mail. Meetings (between General Meetings) on specific matters best dealt with by dialogue shall normally be by telephone conference or similar means.

The Accord\_Secretariat shall be responsible for communication with the media, through press releases and other means as appropriate; and shall ensure that the global community of organizations responsible for architectural education and its accreditation are made aware of the Canberra Accord, its principles and objectives and the processes for the admission of new signatory systems to the Accord.

The **Accord**\_Secretariat will be expected to take on the role of advocate for the recognition, by regulators of architects, of the professional degree qualifications covered by the Accord. Guidance on the nature and level of this activity should be agreed by the signatory systems at General Meetings.

All communications shall be in English.

## **APPENDIX A:**

### **Schedule of First Round of Periodic Reviews**

*By July 2010*

Consejo Mexicano De Acreditación de la Enseñanza de la Arquitectura  
(COMAEA)  
Korea Architectural Accrediting Board (KAAB)

*By April 2011*

National Board of Architectural Accreditation of China (NBAA)

*By April 2012*

Canadian Architectural Certification Board/Conseil canadien de certification en  
architecture (CACB/CCCA)

*By April 2013*

National Architectural Accrediting Board of the US (NAAB)

*By April 2014*

Commonwealth Association of Architects (CAA)

*By April 2015*

Australian Institute of Architects (RAIA)

### **Schedule of Second Round of Periodic Reviews**

*By July 2016*

Acreditadora Nacional de Programas de Arquitectura y Disciplinas del Espacio  
Habitable A. C. (ANPADEH)

(ANPADEH replaced Consejo Mexicano De Acreditación de la Enseñanza de la  
Arquitectura (COMAEA)  
Korea Architectural Accrediting Board (KAAB)

*By April 2017*

National Board of Architectural Accreditation of China (NBAA)

*By April 2018*

Canadian Architectural Certification Board/Conseil canadien de certification en  
architecture (CACB/CCCA)

*By April 2019*

National Architectural Accrediting Board of the US (NAAB)

*By April 2020*

Commonwealth Association of Architects (CAA)

*By April 2021*

Australian Institute of Architects (RAIA)

## **APPENDIX B: Periodic Review Report Template**

CONFIDENTIAL

## **Canberra Accord on Architectural Education**

Type of Report: **Periodic Review**

Name of Accreditation, Validation or Recognition System Reviewed (hereafter referred to as 'Accreditation System'):

---

Dates of Review Visit(s):

Date of Review Report:

Status/Edition: (draft/final/confirmed)

## B. 1. Introduction

- a) Summary  
*[This section should include some context for the review: who made the request, when, and under what circumstances. Also please identify all visits upon which the report is based (university, organization, etc.)]*
- b) Reviewers  
*[Enter name(s) and contact details]*

## B. 2. Recommendation

- a) Recommendation to Canberra Accord signatory systems:  
*[Recommendations open to reviewers:*
  - 1. *that the accreditation system in question be accepted by the other signatory systems, for a period of **six years**, as leading to outcomes substantially equivalent to those from the other signatory systems;*
  - or*
  - 2. *that the accreditation system in question be accepted by the other signatory systems, for a period of not more than **three years**, subject to the responsible signatory system providing, within six months, a report which satisfies the other signatory systems that adequate steps are being taken to address the specific deficiencies or concerns identified by the review team;*
  - or*
  - 3. *that the accreditation system in question has such serious deficiencies with respect to the characteristics, principles, and/or criteria required of a signatory system, that the signatory system **reverts immediately to provisional status.***
- b) Operational and educational output standards  
*[Say whether the overall operational and educational output standards were or were not found to be substantially equivalent to those of other signatory systems in the Canberra Accord.]*
- c) Compliance with criteria for substantial equivalence  
*[List here any criteria not substantially equivalent with comments below in section B. 3 on confirmation, or not, after each individual criterion.]*

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

*[Comment under each item in sections I-V on whether adequate compliance has been met/not met]*

### I. General Characteristics

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

- a) be named organizations (authorities, agencies, or institutions) that are representative of the architecture profession and which have statutory powers or recognized professional authority for accrediting, validating or recognizing programs designed to satisfy the academic requirements for

admission to the profession in the locality where accreditation, validation or recognition takes place, subject to additional requirements imposed by local regulations and practice requirements;

- b) be independent of the academic institutions, professional organizations, and government agencies delivering accredited programs within their jurisdiction;
- c) have an active, robust accreditation system in place, with established processes, procedures, and practices that are well-documented;
- d) have a record of accomplishment in accreditation with sufficient experience and magnitude of operation (normally a minimum of five programs over at least seven years).

## **II. Common Agreed Principles**

Systems for the accreditation of architecture programs are expected to be underpinned by common agreed principles such as:

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

## **III. Criteria for Accreditation, Validation or Recognition**

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

- a) a suitable environment to deliver the program;
- b) adequate leadership for the program;

- c) a team of suitably qualified people teaching in the program;
- d) a curriculum providing a broad preparation for architectural practice;
- e) appropriate entry, progression, and exit standards;
- f) adequate human, physical, and financial resources to support the program;
- g) periodic re-evaluation to maintain accreditation status;
- h) a period of academic study at, or in association with, a university/tertiary-level institution sufficient to demonstrate skills, abilities, attitudes and knowledge at a defined standard adequate for initial entry to the architecture profession; in order to gain the balanced acquisition of subjects and capabilities, this period of academic study should be normally not less than the equivalent of five years full-time studies.

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

As External Quality Assurance Agencies (EQAA), signatory systems should embrace the key principles of the *Guidelines of Good Practice* published by INQAAHE (revised edition 2006).

The EQAA:

- a) has a written mission statement or set of objectives that takes into account its cultural and historical context.
- b) has adequate and accessible human and financial resources to conduct external evaluation effectively and efficiently in accordance with its mission statement and its methodological approach.
- c) has a system of continuous quality assurance of its own activities that emphasizes flexibility in response to the changing nature of higher education, the effectiveness of its operations, and its contribution towards the achievement of its objectives.
- d) informs and responds to the public in accordance with applicable legislation and the cultural context of the EQAA.
- e) recognizes that institutional and programmatic quality and quality assurance are primarily the responsibility of the higher education institutions themselves; respects the academic autonomy, identity and integrity of the institutions or programs; applies standards or criteria that have been subject to reasonable consultation with stakeholders; and aims to contribute to both quality improvement and accountability of the institution.
- f) has documents that indicate clearly what the EQAA expects of the institution.

- g) has documentation concerning self-evaluation which explains the purposes, procedures, process and expectations in the self-evaluation process. The documents also include the standards used, the decision criteria, the reporting format, and other information needed by the higher education institution.
- h) has clear documentation concerning the external evaluation that states the standards used, assessment methods and processes, decision criteria, and other information necessary for external review.
- i) evaluations address both the higher education institution's own self-assessment and external reference points, such as judgments by knowledgeable peers or relevant legislation.
- j) has appropriate methods and policies for appeals.
- k) collaborates with other EQAAs, if possible, in areas such as exchange of good practices, capacity building, review of decisions, provision of transnational education, joint projects, and staff exchanges.
- l) has policies relating to both imported and exported higher education.

#### **V. UNESCO-UIA *Charter for Architectural Education***

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

- In any system of accreditation it is of prime importance to establish the standards of achievement to be attained and the means of assessment through peer group review.
- Of equal importance is the need to encourage diversity, innovation, and development.

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

- a) an ability to create architectural designs that satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements.
- b) an adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies, and human sciences.
- c) knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design.
- d) an adequate knowledge of urban design, planning, and the skills involved in the planning process.

- e) an understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and of the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale.
- f) an understanding of the profession of architecture and the role of the architect in society, in particular in preparing briefs that take into account social factors.
- g) an understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project.
- h) an understanding of the structural design, constructional, and engineering problems associated with building design.
- i) an adequate knowledge of physical problems and technologies and of the function of buildings so as to provide them with internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate.
- j) the design skills necessary to meet building users' requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations.
- k) an adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations, regulations, and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into overall planning.

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

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

#### **B. 4. Commentary**

- a) Self evaluation by signatory system  
*[Brief comments on documents provided]*

- b) Refer to any changes to system mapped against Accord compliance criteria (see section 1.0 of Rules and Procedures) and any recent challenges to system
- c) Other documentation by signatory system
- d) Accreditation visit by signatory system
- e) Meetings with representatives of signatory system
- f) Overview of criteria, policies, and procedures of the system  
*[A brief executive summary]*
- g) Conclusion  
*[Identify critical issues for the system in the near future (1-5 years)]*

## **B. 5. Attachments**

- a) Documentation provided prior to the review visit  
*[List only; full documentation will be posted electronically]*
- b) Additional information supplied during the review visit  
*[List only; full documentation will be posted electronically]*
- c) Review visit agenda and record of meetings  
*[Synopsis only]*

## **B. 6. Report Signatures**

---

Accord Reviewer Representing Practice

---

Accord Reviewer Representing Education

---

Local Facilitator (observer of above signatures)

## **APPENDIX C: Provisional Review Report Template**

CONFIDENTIAL

## **Canberra Accord on Architectural Education**

Type of Report: **Provisional Review**

Name of Accreditation System Reviewed:

---

Dates of Review Visit(s):

Date of Review Report:

Status/Edition: (draft/final/confirmed)

## C.1. Introduction

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

## C.2. Recommendation

- a) Recommendation to Canberra Accord signatory systems:  
*[Recommendations open to reviewers:*
  - 1. *that the accreditation system being reviewed should be accepted by the other signatory systems as leading to outcomes substantially equivalent to those of existing signatory systems, and that the system be transferred from provisional to signatory status for a period of **six years**;*
  - or*
  - 2. *that the accreditation system being reviewed should not be accepted by the signatory systems as being substantially equivalent to the existing signatory systems and that the system should **continue to have provisional status** for a further period of two years.**Where transfer to signatory status is not recommended, details should be provided of the actions required by the system before it will be considered for further review by the Accord.]*
- b) Operational and educational output standards  
*[Say whether the overall operational and educational output standards were or were not found to be substantially equivalent to those of other signatory systems in the Canberra Accord.]*
- c) Compliance with criteria for substantial equivalence  
*[List here any criteria not substantially equivalent with comments below in section C.3 on confirmation, or not, after each individual criterion.]*

## C.3. Characteristics, Principles, and Criteria for Assessing Substantial Equivalency

*[Comment under each item in sections I-V on whether adequate compliance has been met/not met]*

### I. General Characteristics

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

- a) be named organizations (authorities, agencies, or institutions) that are representative of the architecture profession and which have statutory powers or recognized professional authority for accrediting/validating/recognizing programs designed to satisfy the academic requirements for admission to the profession in the locality

where accreditation takes place, subject to additional requirements imposed by local regulations and practice requirements;

- b) be independent of the academic institutions, professional organizations, and government agencies delivering accredited programs within their jurisdiction;
- c) have an active, robust accreditation system in place, with established processes, procedures, and practices that are well-documented;
- d) have a record of accomplishment in accreditation with sufficient experience and magnitude of operation (normally a minimum of five programs over at least seven years).

## **II. Common Agreed Principles**

Systems for the accreditation of architecture programs are expected to be underpinned by common agreed principles such as:

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

## **III. Criteria for Accreditation**

The criteria for accreditation should address the following:

- a) a suitable environment to deliver the program;
- b) adequate leadership for the program;
- c) suitably qualified people teaching in the program;

- d) a curriculum providing a broad preparation for architectural practice;
- e) appropriate entry, progression, and exit standards;
- f) adequate human, physical, and financial resources to support the program;
- g) periodic re-evaluation to maintain accreditation status;
- h) a period of academic study at, or in association with, a university/tertiary-level institution sufficient to demonstrate skills, abilities, attitudes and knowledge at a defined standard adequate for initial entry to the architecture profession; in order to gain the balanced acquisition of subjects and capabilities, this period of academic study should be not less than the equivalent of five years full-time studies.

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

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

The EQAA:

- a) has a written mission statement or set of objectives that takes into account its cultural and historical context.
- b) has adequate and accessible human and financial resources to conduct external evaluation effectively and efficiently in accordance with its mission statement and its methodological approach.
- c) has a system of continuous quality assurance of its own activities that emphasizes flexibility in response to the changing nature of higher education, the effectiveness of its operations, and its contribution towards the achievement of its objectives.
- d) informs and responds to the public in accordance with applicable legislation and the cultural context of the EQAA.
- e) recognizes that institutional and programmatic quality and quality assurance are primarily the responsibility of the higher education institutions themselves; respects the academic autonomy, identity and integrity of the institutions or programs; applies standards or criteria that have been subject to reasonable consultation with stakeholders; and aims to contribute to both quality improvement and accountability of the institution.
- f) has documents that indicate clearly what the EQAA expects of the institution.
- g) has documentation concerning self-evaluation which explains the purposes, procedures, process and expectations in the self-evaluation process. The

documents also include the standards used, the decision criteria, the reporting format, and other information needed by the higher education institution.

- h) has clear documentation concerning the external evaluation that states the standards used, assessment methods and processes, decision criteria, and other information necessary for external review.
- i) evaluations address both the higher education institution's own self-assessment and external reference points, such as judgments by knowledgeable peers or relevant legislation.
- j) has appropriate methods and policies for appeals.
- k) collaborates with other EQAAs, if possible, in areas such as exchange of good practices, capacity building, review of decisions, provision of transnational education, joint projects, and staff exchanges.

#### **V. UNESCO-UIA *Charter for Architectural Education***

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

- In any system of accreditation it is of prime importance to establish the standards of achievement to be attained and the means of assessment through peer group review.
- Of equal importance is the need to encourage diversity, innovation, and development.

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

- a) An ability to create architectural designs that satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements.
- b) An adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies, and human sciences.
- c) Knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design.
- d) An adequate knowledge of urban design, planning, and the skills involved in the planning process.
- e) An understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and of the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale.

- f) An understanding of the profession of architecture and the role of the architect in society, in particular in preparing briefs that take into account social factors.
- g) An understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project.
- h) An understanding of the structural design, constructional, and engineering problems associated with building design.
- i) An adequate knowledge of physical problems and technologies and of the function of buildings so as to provide them with internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate.
- j) The design skills necessary to meet building users' requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations.
- k) An adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations, regulations, and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into overall planning.
- l) Awareness of responsibilities toward human, social, cultural, urban, architectural, and environmental values, as well as architectural heritage.
- m) Adequate knowledge of the means of achieving ecologically sustainable design and environmental conservation and rehabilitation.
- n) Development of a creative competence in building techniques, founded on a comprehensive understanding of the disciplines and construction methods related to architecture.
- o) Adequate knowledge of project financing, project management, cost control, and methods of project delivery.
- p) Training in research techniques as an inherent part of architectural learning, for both students and teachers.

#### **C. 4. Commentary**

- a) Self evaluation by system applying for signatory status  
*[Brief comments on documents provided]*
- b) Refer to any changes to system mapped against Accord compliance criteria (see section 1.0 of Rules and Procedures) and any recent challenges to system
- c) Other documentation by system
- d) Accreditation visit by system
- e) Meetings with representatives of system

- f) Overview of criteria, policies and procedures of the system  
*[A brief executive summary]*
- g) Conclusion  
*[Identify critical issues for the system in the near future (1-5 years)]*

### **C. 5. Attachments**

- a) Documentation provided prior to the review visit  
*[List only; full documentation will be posted electronically]*
- b) Additional information supplied during the review visit  
*[List only; full documentation will be posted electronically]*
- c) Review visit agenda and record of meetings  
*[Synopsis only]*

## **C. 6. Report Signatures**

---

Accord Reviewer Representing Practice

---

Accord Reviewer Representing Education

---

Local Facilitator

## **APPENDIX D: Advisory Review Report Template**

CONFIDENTIAL

## **Canberra Accord on Architectural Education**

Type of Report: **Advisory Review**

Name of Accreditation System Reviewed:

---

Dates of Review Visit(s):

Date of Review Report:

Status/Edition: (draft/final/confirmed)

## **D.1. Introduction**

- a) Summary  
*[This section should include some context for the review: who made the request, when, and under what circumstances. Also please identify all visits upon which the report is based (university, organization, etc.)]*
- b) Reviewer(s)  
*[Enter name(s) and contact details]*

## **D.2. For Consideration**

- a) Recommendations to system reviewed  
*[Choices here might include application for provisional review, further development of system, mentoring by signatory systems, etc.]*
- b) Operational and educational output standards  
*[Say whether the overall operational and educational output standards were or were not found to be substantially equivalent to those of other signatory systems in the Canberra Accord.]*
- c) Compliance with criteria for substantial equivalence  
*[List here any criteria not substantially equivalent with comments below in section D.3 on confirmation, or not, after each individual criterion.]*

## **D.3. Characteristics, Principles, and Criteria for Assessing Substantial Equivalency**

*[Comment under each item in sections I-V on whether adequate compliance has been met/not met]*

### **I. General Characteristics**

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

- a) be named organizations (authorities, agencies, or institutions) that are representative of the architecture profession and which have statutory powers or recognized professional authority for accrediting/validating/recognizing programs designed to satisfy the academic requirements for admission to the profession in the locality where accreditation takes place, subject to additional requirements imposed by local regulations and practice requirements;
- b) be independent of the academic institutions, professional organizations, and government agencies delivering accredited programs within their jurisdiction;
- c) have an active, robust accreditation system in place, with established processes, procedures, and practices that are well-documented;

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

## **II. Common Agreed Principles**

Systems for the accreditation of architecture programs are expected to be underpinned by common agreed principles such as:

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

## **III. Criteria for Accreditation**

The criteria for accreditation should address the following:

- a) a suitable environment to deliver the program;
- b) adequate leadership for the program;
- c) suitably qualified people teaching in the program;
- d) a curriculum providing a broad preparation for architectural practice;
- e) appropriate entry, progression, and exit standards;
- f) adequate human, physical, and financial resources to support the program;
- g) periodic re-evaluation to maintain accreditation status;

- h) a period of academic study at, or in association with, a university/tertiary-level institution sufficient to demonstrate skills, abilities, attitudes and knowledge at a defined standard adequate for initial entry to the architecture profession; in order to gain the balanced acquisition of subjects and capabilities, this period of academic study should be not less than the equivalent of five years full-time studies.

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

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

The EQAA:

- a) has a written mission statement or set of objectives that takes into account its cultural and historical context.
- b) has adequate and accessible human and financial resources to conduct external evaluation effectively and efficiently in accordance with its mission statement and its methodological approach.
- c) has a system of continuous quality assurance of its own activities that emphasizes flexibility in response to the changing nature of higher education, the effectiveness of its operations, and its contribution towards the achievement of its objectives.
- d) informs and responds to the public in accordance with applicable legislation and the cultural context of the EQAA.
- e) recognizes that institutional and programmatic quality and quality assurance are primarily the responsibility of the higher education institutions themselves; respects the academic autonomy, identity and integrity of the institutions or programs; applies standards or criteria that have been subject to reasonable consultation with stakeholders; and aims to contribute to both quality improvement and accountability of the institution.
- f) has documents that indicate clearly what the EQAA expects of the institution.
- g) has documentation concerning self-evaluation which explains the purposes, procedures, process and expectations in the self-evaluation process. The documents also include the standards used, the decision criteria, the reporting format, and other information needed by the higher education institution.
- h) has clear documentation concerning the external evaluation that states the standards used, assessment methods and processes, decision criteria, and other information necessary for external review.

- i) evaluations address both the higher education institution's own self-assessment and external reference points, such as judgments by knowledgeable peers or relevant legislation.
- j) has appropriate methods and policies for appeals.
- k) collaborates with other EQAAs, if possible, in areas such as exchange of good practices, capacity building, review of decisions, provision of transnational education, joint projects, and staff exchanges.
- l) has policies relating to both imported and exported higher education.

#### **V. UNESCO-UIA *Charter for Architectural Education***

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

- In any system of accreditation it is of prime importance to establish the standards of achievement to be attained and the means of assessment through peer group review.
- Of equal importance is the need to encourage diversity, innovation, and development.

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

- a) An ability to create architectural designs that satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements.
- b) An adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies, and human sciences.
- c) Knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design.
- d) An adequate knowledge of urban design, planning, and the skills involved in the planning process.
- e) An understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and of the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale.
- f) An understanding of the profession of architecture and the role of the architect in society, in particular in preparing briefs that take into account social factors.
- g) An understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project.
- h) An understanding of the structural design, constructional, and engineering problems associated with building design.

- i) An adequate knowledge of physical problems and technologies and of the function of buildings so as to provide them with internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate.
- j) The design skills necessary to meet building users' requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations.
- k) An adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations, regulations, and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into overall planning.
- l) Awareness of responsibilities toward human, social, cultural, urban, architectural, and environmental values, as well as architectural heritage.
- m) Adequate knowledge of the means of achieving ecologically sustainable design and environmental conservation and rehabilitation.
- n) Development of a creative competence in building techniques, founded on a comprehensive understanding of the disciplines and construction methods related to architecture.
- o) Adequate knowledge of project financing, project management, cost control, and methods of project delivery.
- p) Training in research techniques as an inherent part of architectural learning, for both students and teachers.

#### **D.4. Advice**

#### **D.5. Commentary**

- a) Self evaluation by system reviewed  
*[Brief comments on documents provided]*
- b) Refer to any recent challenges to system
- c) Other documentation by system
- d) Accreditation visit by system
- e) Meetings with representatives of system
- f) Overview of criteria, policies, and procedures of the system  
*[A brief executive summary]*
- g) Conclusion  
*[Identify critical issues for the system in the near future (1-5 years)]*

## **D.6. Attachments**

- a) Documentation provided prior to the advisory visit  
*[List only]*
- b) Additional information supplied during the advisory visit  
*[List only]*
- c) Advisory visit agenda and record of meetings  
*[Synopsis only]*

## **D. 7. Report Signatures**

---

Accord Reviewer

---

Local Facilitator

## **APPENDIX E: Characteristics, Principles, and Criteria for Assessing Substantial Equivalency**

### **I. General Characteristics**

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

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

### **II. Common Agreed Principles**

Systems for the accreditation of architecture programs are expected to be underpinned by common agreed principles such as:

- a) the system must operate at all times in accordance with a high standard of professionalism, ethics, and objectivity;
- b) the process must be transparent and consistent;
- c) the activities must be conducted in relation to individual programs in confidence and with firmly established procedures and conditions for objective and consistent evaluation;
- d) those involved in the accreditation process must be knowledgeable and competent in matters related to architectural accreditation, education, and practice;
- e) accreditation is of individual programs/academic awards/qualifications and not of institutions;
- f) evaluations of specified academic programs are conducted by peer reviewers and must include review of the program's self-evaluation documents, a site visit, and inspection of student work;

- g) the standard of students' work should be the main criterion in determining accreditation;
- h) levels of physical, financial, human, and information resources should be appropriate to the context of the institution.

### **III. Criteria for Accreditation**

The criteria for accreditation should address the following:

- a) a suitable environment to deliver the program;
- b) adequate leadership for the program;
- c) suitably qualified people teaching in the program;
- d) a curriculum providing a broad preparation for architectural practice;
- e) appropriate entry and progression standards;
- f) adequate human, physical, and financial resources to support the program;
- g) periodic re-evaluation to maintain accreditation status;
- h) a period of academic study at, or in association with, a university/tertiary-level institution sufficient to demonstrate skills, abilities, attitudes and knowledge at a defined standard adequate for initial entry to the architecture profession; in order to gain the balanced acquisition of subjects and capabilities, this period of academic study should be not less than the equivalent of five years full-time studies.

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

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

The EQAA:

- a) has a written mission statement or set of objectives that takes into account its cultural and historical context.
- b) has adequate and accessible human and financial resources to conduct external evaluation effectively and efficiently in accordance with its mission statement and its methodological approach.
- c) has a system of continuous quality assurance of its own activities that emphasizes flexibility in response to the changing nature of higher education, the effectiveness of its operations, and its contribution towards the achievement of its objectives.
- d) informs and responds to the public in accordance with applicable legislation and the cultural context of the EQAA.

- e) recognizes that institutional and programmatic quality and quality assurance are primarily the responsibility of the higher education institutions themselves; respects the academic autonomy, identity and integrity of the institutions or programs; applies standards or criteria that have been subject to reasonable consultation with stakeholders; and aims to contribute to both quality improvement and accountability of the institution.
- f) has documents that indicate clearly what the EQAA expects of the institution.
- g) has documentation concerning self-evaluation which explains the purposes, procedures, process and expectations in the self-evaluation process. The documents also include the standards used, the decision criteria, the reporting format, and other information needed by the higher education institution.
- h) has clear documentation concerning the external evaluation that states the standards used, assessment methods and processes, decision criteria, and other information necessary for external review.
- i) evaluations address both the higher education institution's own self-assessment and external reference points, such as judgments by knowledgeable peers or relevant legislation.
- j) has appropriate methods and policies for appeals.
- k) collaborates with other EQAAs, if possible, in areas such as exchange of good practices, capacity building, review of decisions, provision of transnational education, joint projects, and staff exchanges.
- l) has policies relating to both imported and exported higher education.

#### **V. UNESCO-UIA *Charter for Architectural Education***

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

- In any system of accreditation it is of prime importance to establish the standards of achievement to be attained and the means of assessment through peer group review.
- Of equal importance is the need to encourage diversity, innovation, and development.

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

- a) An ability to create architectural designs that satisfy both aesthetic and technical requirements.

- b) An adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies, and human sciences.
- c) Knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design.
- d) An adequate knowledge of urban design, planning, and the skills involved in the planning process.
- e) An understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and of the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale.
- f) An understanding of the profession of architecture and the role of the architect in society, in particular in preparing briefs that take into account social factors.
- g) An understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project.
- h) An understanding of the structural design, constructional, and engineering problems associated with building design.
- i) An adequate knowledge of physical problems and technologies and of the function of buildings so as to provide them with internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate.
- j) The design skills necessary to meet building users' requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations.
- k) An adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations, regulations, and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into overall planning.
- l) Awareness of responsibilities toward human, social, cultural, urban, architectural, and environmental values, as well as architectural heritage.
- m) Adequate knowledge of the means of achieving ecologically sustainable design and environmental conservation and rehabilitation.
- n) Development of a creative competence in building techniques, founded on a comprehensive understanding of the disciplines and construction methods related to architecture.
- o) Adequate knowledge of project financing, project management, cost control, and methods of project delivery.
- p) Training in research techniques as an inherent part of architectural learning, for both students and teachers.

## APPENDIX F: Accepted Definitions/Glossary of Terms

### F.1. Abbreviations

ANPADEH	Acreditadora Nacional de Programas de Arquitectura y Disciplinas del Espacio Habitable (Replaced COMAEA)
CA	Canberra Accord
CAA	Commonwealth Association of Architects
CACB/CCCA	Canadian Architectural Certification Board/Conseil canadien de certification en architecture
COMAEA	Consejo Mexicano de Acreditación de Enseñanza de la Arquitectura (Replaced by ANPADEH)
EQAA	External Quality Assurance Agencies
KAAB	Korean Architectural Accreditation Board
INQAAHE	International Network of Quality Assurance Agencies in Higher Education
NAAB	National Architectural Accrediting Board of the USA
NBAA	National Board of Architectural Accreditation of China
RAIA	Australian Institute of Architects
UIA	Union Internationale des Architectes/International Union of Architects
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation

### F.2. Glossary

Definitions of words and terms used in the Canberra Accord:

Academic requirements	Courses, programs or examinations in architecture accepted by national authorities as meeting the academic component necessary for membership of a professional institute and/or the practice of architecture
Academic institution	A tertiary-level place of higher learning, usually a university, suitable for the study of

	architecture at the professional level
Academic outcomes	Student work undertaken as part of an architecture program, and which is used to assess learning outcomes
Academic qualifications	Degrees, diplomas or other qualifications awarded by an academic institution to those who successfully complete a program of study
Accord review team	A team of suitably qualified professionals deputed to conduct a review of an accreditation, validation or recognition system on behalf of the Canberra Accord (normally comprising two people, one educator and one practitioner, assisted by a local facilitator)
Accreditation	The granting of approval/recognition to an educational institute for a course, program or examination, which has been tested to produce results of a minimum acceptable standard against set criteria; used interchangeably with 'validation' (see below)
Accreditation of academic programs, not institutions	One of the common agreed principles of Canberra Accord is that for the purposes of accreditation, signatories evaluate the quality of individual academic programs, academic awards or qualifications rather than the educational institutions within which they reside
Accreditation,/validation/recognition criteria	The educational criteria that define the minimum levels of knowledge, understanding and ability that students must acquire in order to qualify as an architect and which are prescribed for the purposes of accreditation, validation or recognition
Architectural heritage	Historical buildings, places and spaces
Adequate leadership	Appropriate quality and quantity of managerial and academic leadership required to deliver an academic program in a school of architecture at the minimum standards required for accreditation (suited to the context)

Adequate human, physical, and financial resources	Appropriate quality and quantity of resources required to support an academic program in a school of architecture at the minimum standards required for accreditation (suited to the context)
Advocate	To publicly support or recommend a cause or policy (eg the Accord Secretariat advocating regulators of architects to recognize professional degrees covered by the Accord)
Advisory review	An optional review of an aspirant signatory system by an individual drawn from the Accord pool of experts
Affirmative, unanimous vote, less one	A positive vote by all the signatories other than the one about which a decision is being reached and is excluded from voting
Applicant system	An accreditation system seeking provisional status of the Accord
Applying agency	An accreditation system applying for provisional status of the Accord
Appropriate entry and progression standards	Signatory systems are expected to address the question of what is an appropriate educational standard for students entering an architectural degree program; and what constitutes appropriate standards and criteria with respect to progress from one stage to the next, within the context within which the program operates
Benchmark	A standard against which things like quality assurance systems and academic requirements can be compared
Benchmarking	The process of checking standards against agreed benchmarks or standards (see benchmark above)
Brief	A term used in certain domains to describe a program for a building design, i.e. a document defining what is required of a new building in terms of performance, accommodation and other relevant information needed before designing can

	begin
Capacity building	A process of sharing information and experience with the intention of developing the skills and competencies of another agency
Calendar days	All days in a period of time including weekends and holidays
Calendar year	The period between 1 January and 31 December in the Gregorian Calendar
Carbon footprint	The measurement of all carbon gasses we individually produce in tonnes (or kg) carbon dioxide equivalent
Certified mail	A postal service which allows the sender proof of sending, as well as proof of delivery
Comparability	Of comparable standard
Competencies	The necessary standards of achievement required in terms of skills and knowledge required to successfully complete a professional architectural degree
Commonwealth	The Commonwealth of Nations normally referred to as 'The Commonwealth' and previously the British Commonwealth'. An intergovernmental organization involving 54 independent states, all but two of which were previously part of the British Empire, and which share common values and goals
Criteria for substantial equivalence	The general characteristics, common agreed principles and criteria used for assessing substantial equivalency described in Appendix E of the Accord Rules & Procedures
Decision criteria	Documented and published criteria used by an External Quality Assurance Agency in arriving at an evaluation decision regarding accreditation
Design brief	See 'brief' above
Desktop review	A review of relevant documents regarding an

	applicant system, which does not entail a site visit
Educator	An individual, normally an architect, whose main professional activity is in architectural education
Ecologically sustainable design	Applying the philosophy and principles of sustainable design with the intention of producing designs which eliminate negative ecological and environmental impact
Electronic mail	E-mail: the normal method of communication between signatory systems; electronic mail using the internet
External examiner	A suitably qualified person appointed by a higher education institution to provide an independent view on student work, as part of the overall process of quality control and audit. Utilized in different ways in different institutions and countries, the role may include taking part in design critiques and/or being a second marker; commenting on syllabus content and examination papers; scrutinizing fairness and consistency of assessment, and comparability of student output between institutions. External examiners are usually appointed for a fixed term and expected to provide annual reports
Facilitator	See 'local facilitator' below
Fine arts	The visual arts, such as painting, sculpture, architecture and photography; and other art forms such as the performing arts
Full-time studies	A program of study requiring full, rather than part-time attendance at an educational institution, usually requiring around 18-20 hours 'contact time', (ie timetabled lectures, tutorials, design studios, workshops, etc) plus additional private study time
General Meeting	A formal, regular meeting of Accord signatories, normally every two years

General Conference Call	A meeting of all signatories held by telephone or other electronic means such as Sykpe
Generic student skills	Defined skills that all students who study on an architecture program recognized by the Accord are expected to acquire and which are described in the criteria for substantial equivalence (see above)
Graduate level	The level above an undergraduate degree; at a level aimed at and for those have been awarded a first degree
Hearing	An opportunity to state one's case
Higher education	Tertiary education; the level of education provided by colleges, universities and other institutes of higher learning, beyond secondary or high school level
Higher education institution	An educational institution beyond secondary education, eg a university, that awards academic degrees, diplomas or professional certifications
Host signatory system	The accreditation system of an Accord signatory, hosting a review visit
Initial entry to the architectural profession	The point at which a graduate moves from architectural education to architectural practice, having completed a period of academic study of not normally less than the equivalent of five years full-time studies
International good practice	An internationally accepted set of guidelines, principles and standards expected of good practice, eg <i>INQAAHE Guidelines for Good Practice</i> , which the Accord uses is used in its benchmark
Imported and exported higher education	A situation where an educational program is delivered in a place remote from its normal home setting, eg 'distance learning'; 'franchised degrees' (see also 'trans-national education' below)
Local facilitator	A local expert appointed to assist an Accord review team, fluent in English and the local language, and familiar with the professional

	context of the host country
Majority agreement	Agreement by more than half the signatory systems
Majority vote	More than 50% of eligible votes
Membership of the Accord	Those systems holding provisional or signatory status
Motion	A formal proposal for a matter to be discussed at a meeting
Nascent system	A new or undeveloped accreditation system
Observer	An individual who, by agreement with all the agencies involved, observes an activity such as a review visit, in confidence, but who takes no part in the discussions or decision-making
On the record	A written record of discussions and decisions taken, for instance with respect to a request for reconsideration of an action regarding a review decision
Operational and educational output standards	The quality of procedural administration and standards of student work required for substantial equivalency under the Accord, described in Appendix E of the Accord Rules & Procedures
Peer group review	The concept of delegating the accreditation of academic courses, programs or examinations to a pool or panel of suitably qualified and approved experts who work to predetermined procedures and educational criteria; this concept recognizes the dynamic state of architectural education, encourages its development and sets minimum standards of achievement against core competencies, whilst encouraging variety of provision
Peer reviewers	Suitably qualified professionals who are appointed by signatory systems to take part in accreditation visits to schools of

	architecture
Periodic re-evaluation	Regular review of an academic program for the purposes of maintaining accreditation status, eg every four or five years
Periodic review	Regular review of a signatory system for the purposes of evaluating substantial equivalency and maintaining signatory status at intervals of not more than six years
Pool of reviewers	A panel of suitably qualified professionals nominated by signatories to undertake reviews of accreditation systems on behalf of the Accord
Positive vote	A vote indicating agreement with or support for something
Practitioner	An individual, normally a qualified architect whose main professional activity is the practice of architecture
Professional degree program	A educational program aimed at providing the academic requirements for the practice of architecture at the professional level
Professional level	The point at which a graduate moves from architectural education to architectural practice, having completed a period of academic study of not less than the equivalent of five years full-time studies (though may not yet be fully qualified as an architect)
Program	A program leading to an academic award in a higher education institution
Project management	The management of construction and other projects
Provisional status review	A review visit to a system that has been accorded provisional status following a successful desktop review
Provisional status	The status accorded to an applicant system that has been subjected to a successful desktop review to test for substantial equivalency

Quality assurance mechanism	A means for ensuring defined operational and/or educational standards
Recognition	The status of being recognized by national authorities as meeting the required academic requirements for a particular purpose (see 'recognized' below)
Recognized	Accredited courses, program or examinations, which are accepted as meeting the academic requirements for admission to membership of a professional institute and/or by a regulatory authority as satisfying the academic requirements for the practice of architecture at the professional level
Report	A written evaluation using an appropriate template (see Appendices B-D of the Accord <i>Rules &amp; Procedures</i> ), produced by a review team following a review visit
Report status/edition (draft/final/confirmed)	<p>A draft report is an initial version sent to the Accord Secretariat by a review team following a review visit.</p> <p>A final report is one that has been checked for factual accuracy by the signatory system visited and which is sent to the other signatories for consideration.</p> <p>A confirmed report is one that has been ratified by relevant signatories</p>
Report template	Templates used for review reports, shown at Appendices B-D in the Accord Rules & Procedures
Return receipt requested	Certified mail with return receipt facility purchased which provides evidence the date of delivery, the recipient's signature and delivery address (see also 'certified mail', above)
Review decision	The ratified decisions contained in a confirmed review report concerning substantial equivalency
Reviewer	A person drawn from the Accord's pool of experts, who has been nominated by one of the signatories, who takes part in a system review

Review team	An Accord review team (see 'Accord review team', above)
Secretariat	The Canberra Accord Secretariat, provided by one of the signatory systems to administer the business of the Accord
Self-evaluation	A written document in which a system or school, etc, reviews itself objectively, looking at strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. Sometimes referred to as self-assessment or critical self-appraisal
Signatory	A member of the Accord having signatory status
Signatory status	An accreditation system that has been reviewed by the Canberra Accord and judged to fulfill the agreed criteria for substantial equivalence, and has signed the Accord agreement
Signatory system	An organization that runs an accreditation system that has signatory status under the Canberra Accord
Special (Teleconference) Meeting	A meeting held specially to address a particular matter that is additional to other regularly scheduled meetings
Split vote	A voting matter that has an equal number of votes for and against the motion
Stakeholders	People, groups, organizations, or systems who affect, or can be affected by an organization's actions
Substantial equivalency	The status of being substantially equivalent (see below)
Substantially equivalent	An academic program that has been identified as being comparable in educational outcomes in all significant aspects and which provides an educational experience meeting acceptable standards, even though such a program may differ in format or method of delivery

Suitable environment	An appropriate educational and physical environment for the successful delivery of an academic program
Suitably qualified people teaching	People with appropriate qualifications and/or experience to teach on an educational program aimed at providing the academic requirements for the practice of architecture at the professional level
Teleconference	A meeting or conference undertaken using telephonic, online or other forms of communication (eg a conference call)
Tertiary-level institution	A higher education institution beyond secondary education, eg a university, that awards academic degrees, diplomas and professional certifications. See also higher education institution, above
Terminated signatory system	A signatory system whose membership of the Accord has been terminated
The Accord	The Canberra Accord on Architectural Education
Transfer of status	The transfer from provisional to signatory status following a successful review visit
Trans-national education	An education provision of one country offered in another (see also 'imported and exported higher education' above)
Two-thirds positive vote	A vote where two-thirds of votes cast are in favor of the motion
Undergraduate level	First degree level
Urban design	The process of shaping the physical setting for life in cities, towns and other urban contexts
Validation	The granting of approval/recognition to a course, program or examination, which has been tested to produce results of a minimum acceptable standard against set criteria. Used interchangeably with 'accreditation' (see above)

Visiting team (from host)	A team of suitably qualified people who undertake a quality assurance visit to a school or other institution on behalf of an accreditation organization. Also referred to as a 'visiting panel' or 'visiting board'.