CONFIDENTIAL

Canberra Accord on Architectural Education

Type of Report: **Periodic Review**

Name of Accreditation/Validation/Recognition System Reviewed:

Commonwealth Association of Architects

_____

Dates of Review Visit(s):

February 24th to 27th 2014

Date of Review Report:

Status/Edition: (draft/final/confirmed)

REVIEW TEAM DRAFT

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.)]

Signatory systems of the Canberra Accord are required to undertake a comprehensive review every six years. A timetable was set and it was decided by the Canberra Accord signatories that the Commonwealth Association of Architects (CAA) would be scheduled for 2014*.*

A visit was organized to take place during a CAA accreditation validation visit to Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology (KNUST) situated in Kumasi, Ghana. The visit was scheduled February 22nd to February 28th in coordination with the Architects Registration Council of Ghana (ARC) and the Ghana Institute of Architects (GIA). The local facilitator named by the CAA Secretariat was Tony Godwin, executive director.

The team members for the periodic review were nominated by the Canadian Architectural Certification Board / Conseil canadien de certification en architecture (CACB-CCCA), and the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB). The two candidates, Richard de la Riva and Gordon Mills, were approved by both the Canberra Accord Secretariat and the CAA. The CAA Executive Director, Tony Goodwin acted as local facilitator to the Canberra Review Team. Further support to the Canberra and CAA teams was provided by Stella Arthiabah, representing the Architects Registration Council of Ghana (ARC), and Sam Afram, for KNUST.

Time-table of the Review Team:

VISIT

Friday-Saturday, February 21st,-22nd

Canberra and CA Reviewers arrive in Accra. Met by TG and ARC representatives.

Sunday, February 23rd

A.M. Early travel by plane from Accra to Kumasi.

Lodging and meals on campus at the KNUST Engineering Guest House.

Informal meeting of the CAA Visiting Team members with CAA Executive Director, (TG), and Clare Newton (CN), Chair of the CAA Executive Committee. CN will act as Secretary to the CAA Visiting Team.

14.00hrs Canberra Team assists a CAA planned half-day training session and briefing for board members at Guest House.

Evening reception at the University Faculty Building.

Monday 24th to Wednesday 26th

Full working days of both Canberra and CAA Teams, from opening visit to concluding exit meeting at KNUST Department of Architecture. Last day concludes at 12.00hrs. Canberra RT coordinates its private meetings and discussions, and advances on report writing.

P.M. Travel Kumasi – Accra. Evening visit.

Thursday February 27th

A.M. Exit meeting with CAA representatives TG and CN at Ghana Institute of Architects and Registration Council offices. Participation of SA, Registration Council representatives and Sithabile Mathe, Botswana based architect and CAA VT member.

Canberra RT deliver a summary of the team's findings, and do not disclose its recommendation to the Canberra Accord signatory system, as addressed in item B.2.a) below.

Afternoon sightseeing and evening reception at hotel organized by GIA. Meeting of local architects and government civil works ministry representatives.

Friday February 28th

Morning sightseeing. Departure of Canberra and CA Reviewers.

POST VISIT

March, April

Work continued on the completion of the report for delivery to the Canberra Secretariat, and subsequent delivery to CAA.

The Canberra Accord Review Team would like to extend their sincere thanks the CAA Executive Director, Tony Godwin, for the openness and sense of cooperation that were made so apparent throughout the visit.
We also wish to express our appreciation to the Dean, Faculty, Staff, and Students of the Department of Architecture of the KNUST for their warm hospitality, and to the Architects Registration Council of Ghana for their most generous courtesy and logistical support.

b) Reviewers

Representing the Canadian Architectural Certification Board /
Conseil canadien de certification en architecture (CACB / CCCA)
Richard de la Riva, practicing architect and visiting teacher
at Université de Montréal, Montréal, Québec
Member of the Ontario Order of Architects,
Ordre des architectes du Québec
1450, City Councillors St, s. 230, Montreal, Québec, Canada H3A 2E6
Tel. 514-861-0133

Representing the National Architectural Accrediting Board (NAAB), US
Gordon Mills, practicing architect
Fellow of the American Institute of Architects (FAIA), National Council of
Architecture Registration Boards (NCARB)
1880 Links Glenn Drive, Dubuque, IA, 52003, USA
Tel. 563-588-2198

B. 2. Compliance

The recommendation has removed from this version that is forwarded to the CAA for its review for factual errors.

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

I. General Characteristics

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 CAA is a non-governmental organization that is entrusted by eight economies to organize and establish the requirements for architectural education accreditation.

In their self-evaluation, the observation is made that the CCA differs from other Canberra authorities in being multinational. The CAA constitution renders it accountable to its constituent membership of National Institutes.

In its Procedures for setting up a Visiting Board, the participation of the national institute or registration authority (or appropriate equivalent) is required, along with the authorized CAA regional representatives.

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

MET

The CAA functions separately and independently from academic institutions, professional organizations, and government agencies in establishing architectural education standards, accreditation policies/procedures, and in making accreditation decisions.

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

MET

The CAA has published qualifications/procedures for accreditation since 1968. The purpose of the lists set out in Qualifications in Architecture Recommended for Recognition by CAA 1990 is "to make available to national authorities a list of those qualifications that the CAA considers they can reliably recommend for recognition. The "Qualifications" is updated periodically and most recently in 2008. CAA is now in the process of another periodic update.

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

As noted in item c.) above, the CAA has been in continuous operation for 46 years. Over this period of time programs at 18 universities have

been accredited. Based on the CAA 5-year revisit cycle, 51 accreditation visits have been made by the CAA.

I. General Characteristics

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 CAA is a non-governmental organization that is entrusted eight economies to organize and establish the requirements for architectural education accreditation.

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

   MET
   The CAA function separately and independently from academic institutions, professional organizations, and government agencies in establishing architectural education standards, accreditation policies/procedures, and in making accreditation decisions.

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

   MET
   The CAA has published qualifications/procedures for accreditation since 1968. The purpose of the lists set out in Qualifications in Architecture Recommended for Recognition by CAA 1990 is "to make available to national authorities a list of those qualifications that the CAA considers they can reliably recommend for recognition. The "Qualifications" is updated periodically and most recently in 2008. CAA is now in the process of another periodic update.

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

As noted in item c.) above, the CAA has been in continuous operation for 46 years. Over this period of time programs at 18 universities have been accredited. Based on their 5-year revisit cycle, 51 accreditation visits have been made by the CAA.

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

As discussed in part B.3.I above, the CAA system has developed its validation expertise through a diversified membership, a high level of international benchmarking and a careful selection of resources and team members. Local expertise is sought for every team. Each team chair is also selected for his experience and capacity in leading the evaluation team. Furthermore the CAA recently arranges an introduction workshop to every visit in order to better prepare team members.

b) the process must be transparent and consistent;

MET

The 'Qualifications in Architecture Recommended for Recognition by CAA: Procedures and Criteria' is found to be consistent with that required by Canberra. The CAA system is well documented. The Review Team further observed that the CAA system and its tools insure consistency in the process. Visiting teams operate through review, 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 CAA's Procedures and Criteria provide the proper guidelines to attain these objectives, and the Review Team observed the rigorous application of these on site.

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 CAA maintains a list of international resources that meet these objectives as we also observed on the KNUST validation visit. Guidance, workshops and online videos and reference material continue to support this concern.

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

MET

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
The full procedures are well defined, including the Validation panel composition and role in the CAA documents. This was also observed by the Review Team, and included review of the specific items listed in this point.

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

MET
As commented above at item (f).

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

MET
The organization of CAA's human and material resources meets the expected standards of Canberra.

III. Criteria for Accreditation/Validation/Recognition

Evidence cited below that links the CAA Procedures and Criteria to those of the Canberra Accord is from the ***Qualifications in Architecture Recommended for Recognition by CAA.***

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

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

MET
Guidelines for physical, financial, human, and information resources are established in the criteria for accreditation for both the BSc. Arch and M. Arch programs in CAA published documents. Evidence for this can be found in A.1.3.

b) adequate leadership for the program/me;

   MET
   Guidelines for physical, financial, human, and information resources are established in the criteria for accreditation for both the BSc. Arch and M. Arch programs in CAA published documents. Evidence for this can be found in A.1.2.

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

   MET
   Guidelines for physical, financial, human, and information resources are established in the criteria for accreditation for both the BSc. Arch and M. Arch programs in CAA published documents. Evidence for this can be found in A.1.5.

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

   MET
   Guidelines for the development of architectural curriculum are established for both the BSc. Arch and M. Arch programs in CAA published documents. Evidence for this can be found in A.1.2, and A.1.4.

e) appropriate entry, progression, and exit standards;

   MET
   Guidelines for the development of architectural curriculum are established for both the BSc. Arch and M. Arch programs in CAA published documents. Evidence for this can be found in A.1.6, and A.2.5.

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

   MET
   Guidelines for physical, financial, human, and information resources are established in the criteria for accreditation for both the BSc. Arch and M. Arch programs in CAA published documents. Evidence for this can be found in A.1.3.

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

   MET
   Guidelines for the periodic re-evaluation of CAA accredited degree programs to maintain their accreditation status are established in CAA documents. These documents are referenced at the beginning of this section and are attachments to this report.

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 CAA accredits the BSc. Arch degree that has a requirement of 4 years of study. The M. Arch degree also accredited by the CAA requires 2 additional 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 CAA documents and website provide an overview of the CAA history and mission. The role and methods of the CAA are clearly put forward. The objectives are stated anew in the current CAA 'Green Book', Procedures and Criteria, and these aim:

> a) to continue to provide the means of recommending recognition of a course to a national authority in a country which does not have its own validation procedure, and
> b) to provide a list of qualifications which can be recommended for recognition by all the constituent national authorities.
> (CAA Procedures, p1 1.1 paragraph 2)

In its 'Introduction, Validation of competencies and variety', section 2.1, the cultural context of ''a wide range of countries and situations as constitute of the Commonwealth'' and ''the necessary diversity'' within ''an increasingly inter-related international context'' is presented.

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 CAA is a lightly structured non-profit organization. It relies on the management of its executive director, Tony Godwin, with the support of part time personnel. Members of the Validation panel Executive Committee and the Chair of Validation volunteer their time and expertise to the CAA.

The CAA administration makes extensive use of the Internet to facilitate communications. The CAA's physical office is located in the Executive Directors residence. Archives and records are maintained and stored by the CAA Executive Director.

The expenses of CAA representatives and Secretaries and the Secretary's fee are reimbursed by the school or shared between local stakeholders. The CAA Self Evaluation informs on charges for CAA validation service (Appendix C). A 'sliding scale' is used to adjust fees to system and discounts are calculated according to Gross National Income of countries.

The CAA February 2014 Self Evaluation concludes: *"The relatively small financial budget does not reflect the committed volunteer input it receives – another indicator of success."* Continuity of service is another indicator of stability.

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 CAA maintains records of Visiting Board Reports. Initial visits began in 1968. Reports are reviewed and approved by the CAA executive committee.

The Commonwealth draws on expertise across the membership and requires both the presence of out-of-region and in-region representatives. This mode of operation is built on flexibility and promotes diversity in a unique multi-national validation system with partnership in all its processes.

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

MET
The CAA website thoroughly presents the objectives, governance and activities of this organism. The site was re-launched in 2013 and can be visited at www.comarchitect.org .

It presents a dynamic platform with its news, Facebook and Twitter links. It is regularly updated with various activities and subjects of interest to the broader public, to students, as to academics and professionals.

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

The CAA published document, *Qualifications in architecture Recommended for Recognition by CAA, Procedures and Criteria* addresses this issue in section 4.2.1: ''the variety of approach and concern inherent in the schools of architecture of the Commonwealth must be respected and nurtured''. In the same 'Green Book', the validation criteria is clear and identifies 'Characteristics required of schools with validated courses', part A.1.

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

   MET

   As discussed under section B.3 and in the previous point.

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 CAA published document, *Qualifications in architecture Recommended for Recognition by CAA, Procedures and Criteria* addresses these issues. Various Appendixes provide specific information to this effect.

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 document discussed above defines the process clearly. For example, Appendix A provides validation criteria, Appendix F, a description of documentation for visiting boards validating courses, Appendix G, an outline programme for visiting boards.

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

   The document discussed above elaborates on Procedures for review of CAA validation procedures and standards in part 3.6 of its presentation of the CAA Validation Panel, that is required to undertake a review of its procedures and standards every six years. The CCA Self-Appraisal states that this most recent process commenced in September 2013. Notice of the review was circulated to stakeholders; CAA member organisations; CAA Council; CAA Validation Panel; CAA listed Schools : '' As part of the review CAA has been looking current best practice in the recently revised procedures from UK, Australia/New Zealand and South Africa. CAA has also found it of immense benefit to be able extend our experience gathering outside the Commonwealth to the systems of the other Canberra Accord signatories.''

j) has appropriate methods and policies for appeals.

MET
The document discussed above elaborates on Procedures for appeals in part 3.7 of its presentation of the CAA Validation Panel.

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
Quoted from CAA documents, and as observed during the visit:
"CAA encourages the general advancement of architecture and architectural education through a system of recognising courses and national/regional validation processes or systems. It does this in order to sustain and raise standards of architectural education across the Commonwealth and to promote the free movement of practising architects, teaching staff and students by facilitating accreditation." Comparative analysis, CAA, Canberra Secrétariat.

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

Non-applicable to CA signatory systems.

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/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*:

Evidence cited below that links the CAA Procedures and Criteria to those of the Canberra Accord is from the **Qualifications in Architecture Recommended for Recognition by CAA.**

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

MET
Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.1.

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

MET
Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.3.

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

MET
Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.4.

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

MET
Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.5.

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
Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.6.

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
Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.8.

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

MET
Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.9.

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

MET
Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.10.

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

Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.11.

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

   MET

   Evidence of this is found in A.2.1.12.

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

   Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.13.

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

   MET

   Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.1, and A.2.2.

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

   MET

   Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.7.

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

   MET

   Evidence for this is found in A2.1.

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

   MET

   Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.13, A.2.1.14, and A.2.1.15.

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

   MET

   Evidence for this is found in A.2.1.9 and A.2.8.

B. 4. Commentary

a) Self evaluation by signatory system
Prior to the visit the Review Team was given CAA's Self-Evaluation Report for our review. The document update, which began in 2013, was completed shortly before our visit and addressed the scope established by the CAA Validation Executive Committee. The report was comprehensive and accurately reflected an overall assessment of accreditation as conducted by the CAA. The report contained a detailed analysis of the challenges the CAA perceives it faces. A copy of the Self-Evaluation Report is attached.

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
   1. Changes have occurred, or are about to occur in three areas. First, the **Qualifications in Architecture Recommended for Recognition by CAA: Procedures and Criteria*** is under review and will be updated in 2014. The purpose of the updating is to improve validation processes and better align criteria with current thinking including those of the Canberra Accord, and to respond to the following:

   1. The rapid growth in the number of schools of architecture in the Commonwealth makes CAA representation on all visiting boards impracticable and the development of validation systems agreements desirable.

   2. The growth in number of Commonwealth countries with their own validation procedures.

   This document is also known as the **Green Book.*

Second, charges for CAA activities were introduced in 2011. The charges are subject to discounts according to number of schools in a country and GNI to avoid a disproportionate burden on less developed countries and those with a small number of schools. There is also a sliding scale accounting for numbers of schools in a system to avoid excessive charging on countries with a large number of schools.

Third, Agreements for the Validation of Courses in Architecture were negotiated for South Africa, and Hong Kong in 2012, and 2013 respectively. The objective of these agreements is to support the development of national peer review processes and accommodate national validation processes with the CAA procedures for the validation of courses (Appendix C).

c) Other documentation by signatory system
The CAA provided all necessary documentation either prior to, or during, the periodic review visit, for the Review Team's assessment of the CAA accreditation process.

d) Accreditation/validation/recognition visit by signatory system

The KNUST accreditation visit began with a training session on Sunday afternoon, February 23, 2014 attended by the CAA visiting team, and the CA Review Team. The Review Team also met to discuss our roles as observers to the KNUST accreditation visit as well as the overall objectives of our review of the CAA accreditation processes as regards the Canberra Accord Rules and Procedures.

While not attending or observing all meetings/inspections during the three day accreditation visit, the Review Team was in attendance for the following:

- Entrance meeting with the Provost the for the School of Architecture
- Program description meeting by the Head of Department of the Undergraduate and Graduate programs
- A welcome party hosted by the Provost at the Senior Staff Club
- Meeting with the External Examiners
- Meeting with Staff
- Meeting with the School of Architecture students
- Tour of the facilities/design classes
- Exit meetings with the KNUST Vice Chancellor and School of Architecture
- This Review Team conducted a thorough and comprehensive review of all CAA documents initially provided, and those requested during the periodic review site visit.

The Review Team's overall impression of the KNUST accreditation visit process was very positive. The visit was conducted in a professional manner by the CAA team with all CAA protocols being followed and their criterion for accreditation being reviewed in detail for both the BSc. Arch and M. Arch programs. The Review Team was given full access to all documents of the visit including the School of Architecture's self-evaluation reports for both programs – see attachments at the end of this report.

e) Meetings with representatives of signatory system

The Review Team met with the following:
- Meetings with representatives of the Ghana Institute of Architects
- Meeting with CAA representatives.

In addition to the above noted meetings the Review Team held several informal discussions with Tony Godwin, Executive Director, of the CAA.

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

The Review Team is confident that the CAA criteria, policies, and procedures are well developed and comprehensive. They are formulated to reflect the issues that are important to the practice of architecture within Commonwealth member economies, as well as issues of international commonality. As noted in this report, the CAA is a strong proponent of self-

evaluation and will not hesitate to modify a policy if, in their view, it needs modifying.

The CAA is outwards looking and progressive, as we also observed in their interest in UNESCO, Union Internationale des Architectes (UIA) and European standards of education and systems of validation.

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

CAA, in their 2014 self-evaluation report noted the following challenges:

1. Future-proofing the procedures to allow for consideration of new modes of delivery of courses and pathways in to architecture qualifications.
2. Updating of criteria to align with current thinking including those of the Canberra Accord.
3. Visit process and improving efficiency including:
- Preparation of board members and working methods during the visit,
- Preparation of documentation and presentation of material by the school,
- Length of the visit (more or less?) and changes to the order of the programme,
- Finishing and signing the report on site.

The CA review team offers the following suggestion to CAA as an opportunity to improve their high quality validation review process even more. Among the several suggestions CAA made to the program at KNUST, there were two that urged fast response; improving library resources available to students and faculty, and improving Internet access. We believe that CAA and the programs that they review would benefit if an interim reporting process were put in place. The process would require programs to update the status on items of this type, perhaps two years after the conclusion of the validation visit. This would add emphasis to the importance of near term work to address these issues. Quite likely it would also help the program secure resources from the university to implement appropriate responses.

In addition, the CA review team notes the continuing disagreement with the RIBA over the recognition of CAA qualifications and UK schools, a situation that CAA is working to resolve.

B. 5. Attachments

a) Documentation provided prior to the review visit
   [List only; full documentation will be posted electronically]
   • Working Program for Canberra Accord Reviewers and Agenda
   • KNUST documentation of information and data for the Bes. Arch., and the M. Arch.

- CAA Self-Evaluation Report
- CAA Self-Evaluation Appendix: Valilist Schools, Qualifications in Architecture Recommended for Recognition by CAA (20.09.13)
- Qualifications in Architecture recommended or Recognition by CAA: Procedures and Criteria (Green Book)
- The Equivalency Matrix demonstrating Substantial Equivalency with the Characteristics, Principles and Criteria Common to all Canberra Signatory Systems.
- CAA Review Visit Management
- CAA Briefing Paper for KNUST Board Training Session
- CAA Validation Report for KNUST in May of 2009
- Excerpts from the Canberra Accord Rules and Procedures: (1.0 Characteristics, Principals, and Criteria)

b) Additional information supplied during the review visit
- Assorted reports from previous CAA Validation visits
- Minutes from CAA Validation Panel Executive Committee Meetings from 20011. 2012, and 2013.
- New agreements between the CAA and the South African Council for the Architectural Profession and the Hong Kong Institute of Architects.

c) Review visit agenda and record of meetings
- The agenda for the visit was referenced on pages 3 and 4 of the attached KNUST documentation of information and data for the Bes. Arch., and the M. Arch.
. The list of meeting attended by the CA observers is listed in B.4.D.

B. 6. Report Signatures

_____

Richard de la Riva, OAA, OAQ
Accord Reviewer Representing Education

_____

Gordon E. Mills, FAIA, NCARB
Accord Reviewer Representing Practice

_____

Tony Godwin, Executive Director, CAA

Local Facilitator

Photo extracted from the CAA website

http://www.comarchitect.org/caa-validation-of-knust-kumasi-ghana-and-canberra-accord-review/

CAA Visiting Board members:

Title/Name	Qualification and Position	Membership/Organisation
Professor Jim Low	BArch (Hons), MSc, PhD, RIBA Birmingham City University	Chair, out of region representativeCAA
Ms Sithabile Mathe	PGDipl, AAB, NAL, BIDP Moralo Designs	In-region representativeCAA
Arc. (Mrs) Cordelia Osasona	BSc (Arch), MSc (Arch), MA (Fine Arts), FNIA Obafemi Awolowo University	In-region representativeCAA
Arc. William Evans Anfom	PGDipl, ARC, FGIA Evans Anfom Associates	MemberGIA
Arc. (Mrs) Stella Arthiabah	PGDipl, MPA (Candidate), PMP, AGIA Architects Registration Council	MemberARC
Arc. Adotei Brown	PGDipl, FGIA, RIBA Deweger, Gruter, Brown and Partners, Architects	MemberGIA

 In Attendance:

Assoc Prof Clare Newton	BArch, GCUT, FRAIA The University of Melbourne