

CONFIDENTIAL

Canberra Accord on Architectural Education

Type of Report: **Periodic Review**

Name of Accreditation/Validation/Recognition System Reviewed:

Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CACB)

Dates of Review Visit(s):

March 2 to 7, 2012

Date of Review Report:

March 7, 2012

Status/Edition: (draft/final/confirmed)

REVIEW TEAM DRAFT

FINAL DRAFT

CANBERRA ACCORD

PERIODIC REVIEW of CACB March 2-7, 2012

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.)

It was decided at the April 2009 meeting of the Canberra Accord signatories that the Canberra Accord comprehensive review visit to CACB would take place in 2012. The Review Team members were nominated by the Canberra Accord signatories and confirmed by the CACB in December 2011. Claudio Brun del Re was designated as the Canadian Facilitator by the CACB and approved by the Canberra Accord. In January 2012 the CACB proposed, and the Administrator of the Canberra Accord and the reviewers agreed, that the visit would take place between March 2 and 7 of 2012.

Friday March 2, 2012

The Canberra Accord Review Team members, Professor Zhu Wenyi and Sungjung Chough, were met by Claudio Brun del Re at the Montreal International Airport (YUL) and escorted to their hotel.

Upon arrival at the hotel the members were provided with a binder of documents including Periodic Review Proposed agenda, CACB CCCA Self-Evaluation Report, Canberra Accord Rules and Procedures, 2010 Edition of CACB Conditions for Accreditation, 2010 Edition of Conditions and Procedures for the Certification of Educational Qualifications required for admission (Registration or Licensing) to the Architectural Licensing Authorities in Canada, 2005 CACB Conditions and Procedures, and CACB (the Association) By-laws Number 1 approved on October 2008, copies of which are attached in section B.5 of this report.

Saturday, March 3, 2012

The Review Team rested for acclimatization and took a guided cultural tour of the city of Montreal.

The team met at 6.00 pm on Saturday March 3, 2012 at their hotel to briefly discuss the review procedure and went over the Visiting Team Report template. The team was also introduced to the McGill Visiting Team who happened to have their preliminary meeting at the same hotel lobby.

Sunday, March 4, 2012

The Review Team and the facilitator (hereafter "the Team") met at 9:00 am in private to discuss and prepare the entrance meeting with the CACB Executives and delegates based on the documents including the CACB Self-Evaluation Report, CA Rules and Procedures CACB Conditions, CCCA procedures, and other documents.

At 10:00 am, the Team met with CACB President, Ivan Martinovic, Secretary-Treasurer, Bianca Lagueux, Terrance Galvin, and the Executive director/Registrar, Mourad

Mohand-Said in the Gauguin Room of the Hotel. The meeting began with a discussion on brief background of CACB-CCCA, Board constitution and membership.

The brief introduction of CACB was followed by a discussion of the history and uniqueness and constitution of the organization, calendar process of accreditation visits, certification procedures, and issues of transparency and equitability, the details of which will be discussed in the appropriate section below.

After lunch with the CACB executives and delegates who attended the meeting, the Team joined the McGill Visiting Team to observe their entrance meeting at 2:30 pm.

According to the changed schedule to coordinate with the McGill Visiting Team's itinerary, the Team left for Ottawa to visit the CACB office at 5:25 pm. Claudio drove all the way and arrived at Ottawa at approximately 7:30 pm.

Monday March 5, 2012

The Team arrived at the CACB-CCCA office at 8:30 am. The executive director Mourad Mohand-Said introduced the team to the CACB staff members: Coordinator of Certification Program, Carolina Celis; Administrative Assistant, Léa Alexandra Price; and Information Officer, Annik Plante. The meeting then began with an introduction to the CACB website by the executive. The issues discussed in depth include consistency and transparency in the final decision making process of the board. The meeting concluded with a tour of the facility. The minutes of the meeting are attached in section B5, P below.

The Team left Ottawa by car at 2:00 pm for the return trip to Montreal, arriving at 4:25 pm.

After a short break at the hotel, the Team joined the McGill Visiting Team to observe their entrance meeting with the students at 5:30 pm. The Team was introduced to the students and Claudio made a precise and condensed introduction of the Canberra Accord, including members, missions, and goals of the Canberra Accord and the purpose of the periodic visit. The meeting lasted until 7:00 pm. Many students of different classes volunteered to present their views on their faculty members, physical resources, courses, and most of all, the image and the vision of the McGill architecture program. The Team was impressed by the active participation and passion of the students to improve themselves and the program. See summary of the visit attached in B5, R below.

Tuesday March 6, 2012

After a morning working session in private, the Review Team joined the Visiting Team's meeting with adjunct professors at 1:30 pm. There was heated discussion here as in the meeting with students. The Review Team was impressed to observe that the Visit Team maintained neutrality and calmed the participants during discussion of particularly controversial issues and managed to focus on the accreditation outcomes without becoming involved in discussing problems and solutions.

The Review Team also witnessed the Visiting Team during deliberations and decisions on outcomes of their visit in the Visiting Team Room at 7:30 pm. The Review Team observed that the Visiting Team fully discussed the issues, carefully examined the evidence, and discussed how concerns would be noted in the VTR and achieved consensus on the outcomes. The Visiting Team took into account past VTR reports. The Review Team also observed deliberations on 'Met' and 'Not Met' outcomes. The Review Team believes that the Visiting Team correctly applied the procedures in evaluating the outcomes.

Wednesday March 7, 2012

CACB EXIT MEETING

At 9:00 am The Team met with CACB-CCCA Executive and delegates to deliver a summary of the Periodic Review draft report in the Gauguin Room.

The Team did not disclose its recommendation to the Canberra Accord signatory systems under B.2a) below.

b) Reviewers

[Enter name(s) and contact details]

Zhu. Wenvi Educator member
zhuwenyi@tsinghua.edu.cn
President of National Board of Architectural Accreditation (NBAA), China
Dean, School of Architecture, Tsinghua University
+86-13601024337
+86-10-62797918
Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, P. R. China

Sungjung Chough Practitioner member
sjchough@gmail.com
+82 10 5206 4677
+82 2 596-4677
Ilkun Architects and Engineers
800-4 Bangbae-dong Seocho-gu
Seoul, Korea 110-

B. 2. Compliance

a) Recommendation to Canberra Accord signatory systems:

CONFIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATION on a separate page.

[Recommendations open to reviewers:

1. that the accreditation/validation/recognition 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/validation/recognition 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/validation/recognition 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.]

The Review Team found that the overall operational and educational output standards were 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.]

The Review Team found that the CACB system complied with all relevant criteria for substantial equivalence as detailed in section B3.

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

NOTE: All cited references in this section are found in Appendix A – CACB Conditions and Procedures.

Organizations running accreditation/validation/recognition 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 program/mes designed to satisfy the academic requirements for admission to the profession in the locality where accreditation/validation/recognition takes place, subject to additional requirements imposed by local regulations and practice requirements;

Met.

The Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CACB –CCCA) is a national, independent and non-profit corporation, whose Directors represent the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities (CALA) and the Canadian Council of University Schools of Architecture (CCUSA) and the Canadian Architectural Students Association (CASA).

b) be independent of the academic institutions, professional organizations, and government agencies delivering accredited/validated/recognized program/mes within their jurisdiction;

Met.

CACB is independent of the academic institutions (CCUSA), provincial organizations, and national professional organizations (RAIC). By agreement of the Registration Authorities (CALA), CACB-CCCA is the sole organization recognized by the architectural profession in Canada to accredit professional degree programs in architecture offered by Canadian Universities (Accreditation Program) and to assess the educational qualifications of architecture graduates (Certification Program).

c) have an active, robust accreditation/validation/recognition system in place, with established processes, procedures, and practices that are well-documented;

Met.

The CACB, since 1993 when it first accredited the University of Waterloo, has initiated a well-documented and transparent accreditation system, defined by the CACB Conditions and the CACB Procedures for Accreditation, and developed from a systematic review and analysis of established international accreditation practices.

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

Met.

The CACB, since 1991, has accredited 11 architecture programs, with on-going accreditation visits to McGill University and University of British Columbia at the time of the Team visit. Currently all 11 architectural programs in Canada are under accreditation.

II. Common Agreed Principles

Systems for the accreditation/validation/recognition of architecture program/mes 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;

Met.

The Review Team observed that the CACB has well established governance structure, Corporate By-Laws and procedures that promote and maintain professionalism, ethical behavior at every level and for all participants.

The Review Team was advised that the CACB recently underwent a review by the Fairness Commissioner of the Province of Ontario, where the CACB office is located, and was cited as being exemplary in the way it delivers its services.

b) the process must be transparent and consistent;

Met.

The Conditions and the Procedures developed by the CACB are found to be consistent with other signatory members, and features a well-documented system with improved checks and balances that promotes consistent and uniform review process.

The VTRs and other statistics are compiled and analyzed in order to improve consistency among VTRs compiled by different individual teams in order to resolve the deviations in the standards of evaluation among different individuals. A template of the VTR was also developed in order to minimize possible deviations among teams.

The Review Team is satisfied that the CACB maintains consistent results and ensures fairness of the accreditation results at the Board level. Consistency is achieved by thorough discussion and majority consensus.

c) the activities must be conducted in relation to individual program/mes in confidence and with firmly established procedures and conditions for objective and consistent evaluation;

Met.

The CACB Conditions and the CACB Procedures, as assessed by the Review Team, is parallel with other signatory members, and features an appropriate degree of confidentiality in a well-documented system that promote consistent and uniform review process in confidence.

d) those involved in the accreditation/validation/recognition process must be knowledgeable and competent in matters related to architectural accreditation/validation/recognition, education, and practice;

Met.

The CACB has established various ways to educate those who are involved in the accreditation process, including participation in the visit as observers to gain first-hand experience, and sending them to the NAAB Team Chair Training Program through their collaborative relationship and mutual recognition agreement.

The CACB also plans to publish a handbook for team chairs and team members to define protocols and processes and set up training programs which will be in place in 2013.

e) accreditation/validation/recognition is of individual program/mes/academic awards/qualifications and not of institutions;

Met.

Accreditation is given to programs, not to institutions.

f) evaluations of specified academic program/mes are conducted by peer reviewers and must include review of the program/me's self-evaluation documents, a site visit, and inspection of student work;

Met.

All of the procedures are well defined in the CACB procedures, including the Visiting Team constitution in the article 1.3.5 Visiting Team, self evaluation (APR) and other procedures.

g) the standard of students' work should be the main criterion in determining accreditation /validation/recognition;

Met.

The Conditions and Procedures developed by the CACB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members, and features a methodological review of the full spectrum of student work. The student performance criteria (SPC) are the main criterion in determining the efficacy of an architecture program (refer to the CACB Conditions 3.1 Student Performance Criteria).

h) levels of physical, financial, human, and information resources should be appropriate to the context of the institution.

Met.

The CACB is a non-profit organization funded by application fees, contributions from its

members, CALA and CCCUSA with adequate level of financial sufficiency. The Review Team was informed that CACB also maintains a 6 months reserve.

III. Criteria for Accreditation/Validation/Recognition

The criteria for accreditation/validation/recognition should address the following:

a) a suitable environment to deliver the program/me;

Met.

The CACB Conditions, as assessed by the Review Team, includes a process by which the program's environment is evaluated, within both the review of the APR and the subsequent site visit (refer to 3.7 Physical Resources).

b) adequate leadership for the program/me;

Met.

The CACB Conditions, as assessed by the Review Team, and includes an appraisal of the program's leadership and decision-making process, in both the review of the APR and the subsequent site visit (refer to 3.5 Human Resources and 3.6 Human Resource Development).

c) suitably qualified people teaching in the program/me;

Met.

The CACB Conditions includes a review of the qualifications and expertise of the teaching human resources of a program, as presented in the APR and evidenced through the subsequent site visit (refer to 3.6 Human Resources).

d) a curriculum providing a broad preparation for architectural practice;

Met.

The CACB Conditions includes the review of the educational matrix from the perspective of curriculum comprehensiveness, as well as a review of the Student Performance Criteria, as evidenced in the program's exhibition of student work (refer to 3.12 Student Performance Criteria).

e) appropriate entry, progression, and exit standards;

Met.

The Conditions and Procedures developed by the CACB, as assessed by the Review Team, and as made apparent by the visit, is consistent with other signatory members.

f) adequate human, physical, and financial resources to support the program/me;

Met.

The CACB Conditions includes a process by which the program's resources are evaluated, within both the review of the APR and the subsequent site visit (refer to 3.6 and 3.7 Human Resources, 3.7 Physical Resources, 3.8 Information Resources, and 3.9

Financial Resources).

g) periodic re-evaluation to maintain accreditation/validation/recognition status;

Met.

The CACB Conditions requests and reviews, on an annual basis, a mandatory Annual Report (AR) from the accredited architecture program, which provides an accounting of the progress the program is making towards addressing the recommendations put forward by the CACB through the Visiting Team Report (VTR).

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.

Met.

The CACB Conditions stipulates professional degrees and curricula in article 3.11, which includes master of architecture degree with a related pre-professional bachelor's degree, master of architecture degree without a related pre-professional bachelor's degree, and bachelor of architecture degree requiring a minimum of five years of study.

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.

Met.

The Review Team found that the CACB documents and website provide an overview of the CACB history and mission in addition to clearly explaining its role and methods.

The CACB Conditions require that the Schools also provide an account of their 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.

Met.

The CACB has a well-established office and facilities with the requisite human and physical resources to offer an accountable and responsive external evaluation framework as stated above.

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.

Met.

The CACB has maintained records of continuous review and update, since it first established them in 1976.

d) informs and responds to the public in accordance with applicable legislation and the cultural context of the EQAA.

Met.

Refer to the comment under II, b) above.

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.

Met.

Refer to comments in section under section B. 3. Characteristics, Principles and Criteria for Assessing Substantial Equivalency.

f) has documents that indicate clearly what the EQAA expects of the institution.

Met.

Same as above.

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.

Met.

The CACB has a well-documented Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation, in print form and as published on the internet. Specifically related to the self-evaluation of the architecture programs, the Conditions and Procedures defines the self-evaluation in the form of an Architecture Program Report (APR), and also specifies the associated review process (refer to 1.1 Submitting the Application for Accreditation, 1.2 Review and Acceptance of the APR, and 1.3 Application and Visiting Team Selection Process.).

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.

Met.

The CACB has well-documented Conditions in print form and as published on the internet. Specifically related to the external evaluation of the architecture programs, the Conditions and Procedures defines the process clearly, including the need and scheduling for the APR, its review, the site visit, the creation of the Visiting Team Report (VTR), its review by the architecture program, and the recommendation by the CACB. (refer to 1.0 Visit Preparation, 2.0 Site Visit, 3.0 Site Visit Follow-up, and 6.0 Petitioning Procedure under Accreditation Process Sequence in the CACB Accreditation Procedure).

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.

Met.

Refer to the comments above.

j) has appropriate methods and policies for appeals.

Met.

The CACB Conditions in print form and as published on the internet, has provisions of equity and fair process. The methodology of evaluation includes an appeal process for the architecture program in disagreement with the findings of the Accreditation Deliberation, and an associated appeal process if necessary. (refer to 6.0 Petitioning Procedure under Accreditation Process Sequence in the CACB Accreditation Procedure).

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.

Met.

The CACB has recently applied for INQAAHE membership which is currently pending. Within Canada, the CACB is a founding member of the Association of Accrediting Agencies of Canada (AAAC) and the CACB's Executive Director, Mourad Mohand-Said, is also the AAAC President for 2011-2012. The AAAC groups 35 accrediting agencies in all fields such as health professions, engineering and so on. The AAAC works to establish best practices for quality assurance through accreditation systems. The Review Team is satisfied that the CACB meets this requirement.

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

N/A

This item does not seem pertinent to any of the CA signatory systems.

V. UNESCO-UIA Charter for Architectural Education

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

- In any system of accreditation/validation/recognition 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.

Met.

Refer to 3.12 Student Performance Criteria (SPC) in the CACB Conditions.

b) An adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies, and human sciences.

Met.

Refer to A7 Cultural Diversity, A8 History and Theory, and A9 Precedents, under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

c) Knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design.

Met.

Refer to criteria General Studies, under Condition 3.11 Professional Degrees and Curriculum and B Design and Technical Skills , under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

d) An adequate knowledge of urban design, planning, and the skills involved in the planning process.

Met.

Refer to Criteria in B: Design and Technical Skills, and C: Comprehensive Design, under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

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.

Met.

Refer to Criteria in A: Critical Thinking and Communication, B: Design and Technical Skills, and C: Comprehensive Design, under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

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.

Met.

Refer to Criteria in D Leadership and Practice under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

g) An understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project.

Met.

Refer to criterion A2 Research Skills, A3 Graphic Skills, and A4 Verbal and Writing Skills and B2. Program Preparation, under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

h) An understanding of the structural design, constructional, and engineering problems associated with building design.

Met.

Refer to Criteria in B: Design and Technical Skills and C: Comprehensive Design, under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

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.

Met.

Refer to Criteria in B: Design and Technical Skills, and C: Comprehensive Design, under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

j) The design skills necessary to meet building users' requirements within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations.

Met.

Refer to Criteria in B: Design and Technical Skills, and C: Comprehensive Design, and in particular, B12 Building Economics and Cost Control, D3 Legal Responsibilities, and D4 Project Delivery, under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

k) An adequate knowledge of the industries, organizations, regulations, and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into overall planning.

Met.

Refer to Criteria in C: Comprehensive Design, and, in particular, D3 Legal Responsibilities, and D4 Project Delivery, D5 Practice Organization and D6 Professional Internship, under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

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

Met.

Refer to Criteria A6 Human Behavior, B4 Sustainable Design B5 Accessibility, B6 Life safety Systems, Building Codes and Standards, D: Comprehensive Design, and in particular, D3 Legal Responsibilities, and D4 Project Delivery, under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

m) Adequate knowledge of the means of achieving ecologically sustainable design and environmental conservation and rehabilitation.

Met.

Refer to Criteria A6 Human Behavior, B4 Sustainable Design, B9 Building Envelopes, B4 Sustainable Design, and C2 Building Systems, under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

n) Development of a creative competence in building techniques, founded on a comprehensive understanding of the disciplines and construction methods related to architecture.

Met.

Refer to Criteria in B: Design and Technical Skills, C: Comprehensive Design, and D: Leadership and Practice, under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

o) Adequate knowledge of project financing, project management, cost control, and methods of project delivery.

Met.

Refer to Criteria in B: Design and Technical Skills, the criterion B 12 Building Economics and Cost Control, in particular, 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

p) Training in research techniques as an inherent part of architectural learning, for both students and teachers.

Met.

Refer to Criteria A1 Critical Thinking Skills and A2 Research skills, and other related criterion, under 3.12 Student Performance Criteria in the CACB Conditions.

B. 4. Commentary

a) Self evaluation by signatory system

[Brief comments on documents provided]

The CACB Self Evaluation report was brief but accurately reflected the structure and requirements of the Canberra Accord Rules and Procedures. The report contained an overview of the CACB-CCCA including role, task, and composition of the CACB Board of Directors. It also included synopsis of the CACB Conditions, the CACB Procedures, changes in the CACB Conditions and Procedures, and upcoming tasks, as specified in the Canberra Accord Rules and Procedures. The stated changes are discussed in the article b) below.

The upcoming tasks were limited to providing an outline on the CACB process to review and develop changes to the Conditions and Procedures. It is regretful to see that the report did not, however, present an overview of tasks beyond 2012.

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

The CACB Self-Evaluation Report included changes in the CACB-CCCA Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation. It was noted that the Conditions and Procedures were edited in 2010 where the student Performance Criteria was "streamlined." It should be noted that although the total number of the SPC was reduced from 37 to 31, the new SPC is more inclusive than before while allowing more freedom of interpretation for programs. It is also noteworthy that the Conditions and Procedures were published in separate volumes.

As previously mentioned, the CACB has a plan to develop a handbook to provide Visiting Team members and chairs with templates and a guideline of protocols and procedures. The Team believes that the handbook will also be valuable for programs to be visited as well as for the training of potential new Visiting Team members. The Team also understood that the handbook will promote greater fairness and consistency.

c) Other documentation by signatory system

The CACB provided all the necessary documentation, including all supplementary documents requested by the Review Team.

Documents provided to and inspected by the Review Team are:

- *Draft Canberra Accord Review Team Schedule and Agenda*
- *CACB CCCA Self-Evaluation Report*
- *Canberra Accord Rules and Procedures*
- *2005 CACB Conditions and Procedures*
- *CACB Conditions for Professional Degree Programs in Architecture, 2010 Edition*
- *CACB Procedures for Professional Degree Programs in Architecture, 2010 Edition*
- *20XX Visiting Team Report (Template for Visiting Team Report)*
- *Conditions and Procedures for the Certification of Educational Qualifications required for admission (Registration or Licensing) to the Architectural Licensing Authorities in Canada*
- *CACB (the Association) By-laws Number 1 approved on October 2008*
- *CACB SPC Guide 2010*

The following documents were given to the Review Team in hard copy or were presented for review at the request of the Team, but are not attached to this report because of their confidentiality:

- *Minutes of CACB Board Meetings including the discussion for final decision.*
- *Visiting Team Report of Master of Architecture Program, University of Calgary*
- *McGill APR for 2012 Visit*

d) Accreditation/validation/recognition visit by signatory system

The Review Team made three visits to McGill University, to observe the CACB Accreditation Visit Entrance Meeting on March 4, Meeting with the Students on March 5, Meeting with the Faculty and deliberation session on March 6.

The Review Team requested and was provided with the school's Architecture Program Report (APR). The report included the information required by the CACB as demonstrated in the Attachment B.5 L.

The Review Team observed the Student meeting. Approximately 100 students attended, with good representation of all years. Students were encouraged to speak and soon raised numerous matters. The Review Team was told that student comments would be considered by the Visiting Team and included in their report. A separate record or minutes of the meeting are not attached to the report.

The review team also observed the meeting with the faculties as described in B.1 a) Summary.

e) Meetings with representatives of signatory system

The review Team had the following meetings with the CACB:

- *Entrance meeting with CACB executives and delegates at 10:00 am on March 4, 2012*
- *Visited the CACB Office in Ottawa for a meeting with the executive director at 8:30*

am March 5, 2012 and review of the documents and tour.

- *Exit meeting with CACB at 10.00 on Wednesday March 7, 2012.*

Refer to B.1 Introduction and Attachments N, minutes of all meetings for details.

f) Overview of criteria, policies, and procedures of the system [A brief executive summary]

The CACB was initially established in 1976 to assess and clarify the academic qualifications of individuals holding a professional degree or diploma in architecture who intended to apply for registration as a professional architect by agreement of the registration authorities and councils of nine provincial institutions and associations.

As the sole organization recognized by the architectural profession in Canada to assess the education qualifications, the CACB only accredits programs offering bachelor of architecture or master of architecture first professional degrees.

Through a comprehensive review of the CACB documents and other related documents, and the observations of the CACB Accreditation Visit to McGill University architecture program, it is clear to the Review Team that the CACB criteria, policies, and procedures are consistent, progressive, and well-managed.

This is apparent not only in the documents themselves, specifically the CACB Conditions and the CACB Procedures for Accreditation, but also in the policies put into practice, as evidenced through the meetings and observations of the visit.

In reference to the Comparative Analysis (2008) discussed by the CA Members, equivalency with other systems was found to be maintained by the CACB. Their recent updates to the Conditions have better organized the requirements and notably, the SPC have been regrouped to improve clarity and to remain relevant with evolving trends and globalization.

g) Conclusion

[Identify critical issues for the system in the near future (1-5 years)]

The Review Team is satisfied that the CACB maintains consistent results and ensures fairness of the Accreditation results at the Board level. Consistency is achieved through discussion and majority consensus.

It was noted that the CACB is developing a web collaboration system, CACB Sharepoint, to promote communication interchange, inform accreditation procedures and proceedings, and develop the process among the program, Visiting Team members, and the CACB. The Review Team believes that the system will considerably enhance overall accreditation process both in terms of time and expense of all parties involved.

The upcoming tasks in the Self-Evaluation Report of the CACB, however, were limited to providing an outline on the CACB process to review and develop changes to the Conditions and Procedures in 2012. It is regretful to see that the report did not present an overview of long range plan beyond 2012.

Although external to the CA requirements, the Review Team would like to commend the CACB for its longstanding experience in Certification which pre-dates accreditation. This allows the CACB to process those individuals that are not graduates of an accredited program. The Canadian Education Standard is used to evaluate an individual based on input measures provided by the applicant, analyzed by a staff coordinator and then verified by a CACB Assessment Committee. The Visiting Team noted that this process could become a model for other CA jurisdictions that also have non-accredited programs.

FACILITATION OF THE CANBERRA ACCORD VISIT

The Review Team thanks the CACB and its staff for the thorough preparation and excellent organization of the visit. Claudio Brun del Re brought a wealth of knowledge and warm hospitality and was tireless in assisting the Review Team and helping them understand all the documents and procedures.

The Review Team commends the Canadian Architectural Accreditation Board for the range and depth of the material provided and clarity of their documents.

B. 5. Attachments

- a) Documentation provided prior to the review visit [List only; full documentation will be posted electronically]
 - A. CV of CACB Facilitator, Claudio Brun del Re***
 - B. Draft Canberra Accord Review Team Schedule and Agenda-Revised***
 - C. CACB CCCA Self-Evaluation Report***
 - D. CACB 2005 Conditions and Procedures***
 - E. CACB Conditions for Professional Degree Programs in Architecture, 2010 Edition***
 - F. CACB Procedures for Professional Degree Programs in Architecture, 2010 Edition***
 - G. 20XX Visiting Team Report (Template for Visiting Team Report)***
 - H. Conditions and Procedures for the Certification of Educational Qualifications required for admission (Registration or Licensing) to the Architectural Licensing Authorities in Canada***
 - I. CACB(the Association) By-laws Number 1 approved on October 2008***
 - J. CACB SPC Guide 2010***
 - K. CACB-CCCA Canadian Education Standard***

- b) Additional information supplied during the review visit [List only; full documentation will be posted electronically]
 - L. McGill 2006 VTR***
 - M. List of visits and accreditation determinations since the start of the CACB accreditation program***

- c) Review visit agenda and record of meetings [Synopsis only]
 - (The visit agenda is included as attachment B above).***
 - N. Summary of All Meetings of the Review Team visit to CACB. March 2-7, 2012***

A selection of photographs taken by the Review Team and by the CACB administrator are also attached.

Refer to B4 c) above for other documents that were provided to the Review Team in hard copy or were tabled for review, but are not attached to this report.

B. 6. Report Signatures

Sungjung Chough, FKIA, Hon. FAIA

Accord Reviewer Representing Practice

Zhu Wenyi, Professor, ASC (P.R. China)

Accord Reviewer Representing Education

Claudio Brun de Re, FRAIC

Local Facilitator