



2015 Visiting Team Report
Master of Architecture Program
Dalhousie University

The Canadian Architectural Certification Board

1 Nicholas Street, Suite 710
Ottawa (Ontario) Canada K1N 7B7

Voice: (613) 241-8399

Fax: (613) 241-7991

E-mail: info@cacb.ca

Web Site: www.cacb-ccca.ca

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction • CACB Accreditation	3
II.	Summary of Team Findings	4
	1. Team’s General Comments	4
	2. Conditions for Accreditation “met” and “not met”: a summary	5
	3. Program’s Progress since the previous site visit	6
	4. Program Strengths	9
	5. Causes of concern and Team’s Recommendations	10
III.	Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation	12
IV.	Appendices	30
	Appendix A: Program Information	30
	1. Brief History of Dalhousie University	30
	2. Institutional Mission	30
	3. Program History	31
	4. Program Mission	32
	5. Program Action Plan	32
	Appendix B: The Visiting Team (names and contact information)	35
	Appendix C: The Visit Agenda	36
V.	Report Signatures	37

I. Introduction • CACB Accreditation

The CACB is a national independent non-profit corporation, whose Directors represent the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities (CALA), the Canadian Council of University Schools of Architecture (CCUSA) and the Canadian Architectural Students Association (CASA). The CACB is both a decision-making and policy-generating body. It is the sole organization recognized by the architectural profession in Canada to assess the educational qualifications of architecture graduates (*Certification program*) and to accredit professional degree programs in architecture offered by Canadian Universities (*Accreditation program*).

By agreement of the Registration Authorities and Councils of nine Provincial Institutes and Associations, the CACB was established in 1976 to assess and certify the academic qualifications of individuals holding a professional degree or diploma in architecture who intend to apply for registration. The Ordre des Architectes du Québec joined the CACB in 1991. In 1991, the CACB mandate to certify degree credentials was reaffirmed and its membership was revised to reflect its additional responsibility for accrediting professional degree programs in Canadian University Schools of Architecture.

The CACB awards accreditation only to professional degree programs in architecture. These are normally:

- Master of Architecture degree with a related pre-professional bachelor's degree; requirement, typically amounting to five or six years of study;
- Master of Architecture degree without a pre-professional requirement, consisting of an undergraduate degree plus a minimum of three years of professional studies;
- Bachelor of Architecture degree requiring a minimum of five years of study, except in Quebec, where four years of professional studies follows two years of CEGEP studies.

The process of accreditation begins at the school with the preparation of the *Architecture Program Report (APR)*. The *APR* identifies and defines the program and its various contexts, responding to the *CACB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation*. The *APR* is expected to be useful to the planning process of the school, as well as documentation for the purposes of accreditation.

Upon acceptance of the *APR* by the CACB Board, an accreditation visit is scheduled. The CACB's decision on accreditation is based upon the capability of the program to satisfy the Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation, including the ability of its graduating students to meet the requirements for learning as defined in the Student Performance Criteria. During the visit, the team reviews student work and evaluates it against these requirements. The team also assesses the effectiveness and degree of support available to the architectural program through meetings with the institution's administrators at various levels, architecture and other faculty, students, alumni, and local practitioners.

At the conclusion of the visit, the Visiting Team makes observations and expresses compliments and concerns about the program and its components. It also offers suggestions for program enrichment and makes recommendations, which, in the judgment of the team, are necessary for the program's improvement and continuing re-accreditation. Following the visit, the team writes the following VTR, which is forwarded with a confidential recommendation to the CACB. The CACB then makes a final decision regarding the term of accreditation.

II. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team's General Comments

The CACB Visiting Team reviewed the professional *Master of Architecture* program (MArch) and the pre-professional *Bachelor of Environmental Design Studies* program (BEDS) at Dalhousie University's School of architecture on 7 – 11 March 2015. The visit was conducted according to the 2012 *CACB Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation*.

The Visiting Team would like to thank the School of Architecture and Dalhousie University for their kind reception. The students, faculty, staff and administrators met by the team were very accommodating and helpful.

All appointments were attended as scheduled, except for the breakfast meeting with Director Burnay on Monday 9, 2015, which was cancelled by the Team Chair.

Requests for additional information

Prior to the visit, in an email to Director Burnay dated March 1st, 2015, the following additional information requested by the Visiting Team was delivered in the team room before the team's arrival:

- Updated and precise information about the IDEA building project: a complete folder was provided.
- Name, resume, and workload of the two new faculty hires that, as mentioned in the 2014 APR, were supposed to have joined the School of Architecture in the 2014-2015 academic year: information on one new faculty member was provided, the second hire having not come through.
- The process of data collection and selection for the survey presented in Condition 3 Program self-assessment: one printed page was provided.
- Explanation on the "dormant" status of the Post-professional Master of Architecture (MArchPP): one printed page was provided.

During the visit, the Visiting Team requested more additional information and further clarification, all promptly responded to either by Dean Macy, Director Burnay or Program Director Parcell:

- More Master Thesis booklets: around 20 were added to the team room.
- *Research in the School of Architecture* (adopted 2/2015).
- *BEDS Undergraduate Architecture Student Portfolio Reviews. External Report* (April 2014, August 2013, April 2012, April 2009, August 2009).
- *Faculty of Architecture and Planning Self study* (June 2007) + *Report for the review of the faculty of Architecture and Planning* (Frascari, 2007) + *Report for the Senate Review Committee for the Faculty of Architecture and Planning, 2007-2008* (Forsyth, November 2007) + *Report of the Senate Committee to Review the Faculty of Architecture and Planning* (May 2008) + *Faculty of Architecture and Planning's response to the Senate review* (October 1, 2008).
- Winter semester 2015 Timetable.

- Inbound and outbound exchange student destinations, 2003-present.
- Requirements for work term completion (February 6, 2014).
- Strategic curricular development and assessment (outline, March 9, 2015), printed copy provided by Dean Macy.
- Curricular Assessment and Development (March 10, 2015): email sent by Director Burnay to the Team Chair, then forwarded to the team members.
- Various additional information sent by email by Program Director Parcell to the Team Chair, then forwarded to the team members.

2. Conditions for Accreditation “met” and “not met”: a summary

	Met	Not Met
1. Program Response to the CACB Perspectives		
<i>A. Architecture Education and the Academic Context</i>	[X]	[]
<i>B. Architecture Education and the Students</i>	[X]	[]
<i>C. Architecture Education and Registration</i>	[X]	[]
<i>D. Architecture Education and the Profession</i>	[X]	[]
<i>E. Architecture Education and Society</i>	[X]	[]
2. Program Self-Assessment	[X]	[]
3. Public Information	[]	[X]
4. Social Equity	[X]	[]
5. Human Resources	[X]	[]
6. Human Resource Development	[X]	[]
7. Physical Resources	[]	[X]
8. Information Resources and Information Technology	[X]	[]
9. Financial Resources	[X]	[]
10. Administrative Structure	[X]	[]
11. Professional Degrees and Curriculum	[X]	[]
12. Student Performance Criteria (SPC)		
A1. Critical Thinking Skills	[X]	[]
A2. Research Skills	[X]	[]
A3. Graphic Skills	[X]	[]
A4. Verbal and Writing Skills	[X]	[]
A5. Collaborative Skills	[X]	[]
A6. Human Behavior	[X]	[]
A7. Cultural Diversity	[]	[X]
A8. History and Theory	[X]	[]
A9. Precedents	[X]	[]
B1. Design Skills	[X]	[]
B2. Program Preparation	[X]	[]
B3. Site Design	[X]	[]
B4. Sustainable Design	[X]	[]
B5. Accessibility	[]	[X]
B6. Life Safety Systems, Building Codes and Standards	[X]	[]

B7. Structural Systems	[X]	[]
B8. Environmental Systems	[X]	[]
B9. Building Envelopes	[X]	[]
B10. Building Service Systems	[X]	[]
B11. Building Materials and Assemblies	[X]	[]
B12. Building Economics and Cost Control	[X]	[]
C1. Detailed Design Development	[X]	[]
C2. Building Systems Integration	[X]	[]
C3. Technical Documentation	[X]	[]
C4. Comprehensive Design	[X]	[]
D1. Leadership and Advocacy	[X]	[]
D2. Ethics and Professional Judgment	[X]	[]
D3. Legal Responsibilities	[X]	[]
D4. Project Delivery	[X]	[]
D5. Practice Organization	[X]	[]
D6. Professional Internship	[X]	[]

3. Program's Progress since the previous site visit

Causes of concern #1 (from 2009 VTR): *The visiting team was struck by a unified teaching approach that favors analog over digital methods of representation, communication and experimentation. The team acknowledges this approach, and is aware of the recent addition of digital fabrication capacity and the fact that the school remains open to a variety of representational techniques. Still, the team must voice its strong concern over the relative lack of the application and exploration of digital techniques in the curriculum and in the student work displayed. This condition may undermine essential pedagogical and professional benefits, including the opportunities to secure internships in an increasingly competitive job market, remain competitive with a profession that has become more complex in its integrative and interdisciplinary approach to the built environment. It may also be detrimental to essential student learning outcomes that focus on the integration of a comprehensive approach to building design.*

2015 Visiting Team Assessment:

This is no longer a cause of concern. Digital methods of representation and communication are evident in the studio, although digital design experimentation and research are still not an established culture. The faculty member specializing in digital fabrication who recently resigned has quickly been replaced. According to students and staff, however, additional and appropriate pedagogical support is needed [refer to Cause of concern #2 in the present 2015 VTR, Section 5, page 10].

Cause of concern #2 (from 2009 VTR): *The team is not satisfied that the program has dealt adequately with the deficiency in the area of comprehensive building design identified by the previous visiting team.*

2015 Visiting Team Assessment:

The team is now satisfied [refer to the assessment of SPC C4 *Comprehensive design* in the present VTR]. This is no longer a cause of concern.

Cause of concern #3 (from 2009 VTR): *While there have been significant improvements to the space and facilities in the Faculty of Architecture and Planning building the Team must point out that some areas remain inaccessible. The Design Studios are overcrowded. The provisions for graduate students in particular are inadequate. The school requires additional space for lectures, classes, reviews, exhibitions and informal meetings. In a program dedicated to the process of making, it is clear that the shops and fabrication facilities need to be expanded.*

2015 Visiting Team Assessment:

This is still a cause of concern, but for different reasons [refer to Cause of concern #3 and to the assessment of Condition #7 in the present VTR].

Cause of concern #4 (from 2009 VTR): *The program should explore ways of improving the level of graduate student financial support.*

2015 Visiting Team Assessment:

The school has been successful in securing funding for students and in informing them of university-wide opportunities. With faculty more involved in research, a culture of TA/RAship may develop in the School of Architecture. This is no longer a cause of concern, although the school should remain attentive to that issue, especially when it comes to the costs associated with out-of-town Free Labs.

Student Performance Criteria “not met” (from 2009 VTR):

Graphic skills (12.2). *Ability to employ appropriate representational media, including computer technology, to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.*

From 2009 VTR: *The student work presented to the Visiting Team reflects a good level of hand drawing. This craft has become a culture within the school and part of the hallmark of the educational system, expressed in many ways across the program, in Design Studios, but also in academic courses in history and theory, building technology and building systems integration.*

While fully respecting the school’s dedication to the craft of architecture and the presentation and preservation of the craft of design and making, the position risks leaving students both less equipped to successfully translate their works into the digital medium that is required to produce them and not having the opportunity to explore the potential of design and representation technologies.

The 2004 CACB report stated “Overall, however, a general lack of engagement with the full potentials of new media and technologies was noted as a concern.” This statement is still true. While computer use is evident in the school, the visiting team found remarkable the preponderance of hand drawn materials in nearly all presentations on display. The students appear to be more comfortable with these traditional forms of representation than with computer graphic techniques for final presentation of projects. Students appeared to be using computer graphics as a back up to manual presentations, or as a tool for some components of their design process, but they then translate this into a series of manual drawings and models. Many of the students stated that they were attracted to the school because of this emphasis on hand crafted process. It appears that there is a taste for manual presentations within the faculty, and that the students respond to this.

2015 Visiting Team Assessment:

This criterion is now met. The team acknowledges a greater variety of graphic skills and representation modes in conceptualization. A continued high level of hand drawing is now meshed with digital drawing, while model making remains an integral part of design integration and process.

Building systems integration (12.22). Ability to assess, select, and integrate structural systems, environmental systems, life-safety systems, building envelope systems, and building service systems into building design.

From 2009 VTR: *Although integration of structural and enclosure systems appears to be adequately addressed in the projects exhibited, there is little evidence of the integration of environmental, life safety or service systems in the design work presented. Again the Coastal Studio is indicated in the matrix as the primary vehicle to address this issue, but there little was little evidence that this is achieved in a meaningful sense.*

2015 Visiting Team Assessment:

This criterion is now met. There is a good level of evidence in the BEDS program, namely in B5 Design studio 4005.

Comprehensive design (12.29). Ability to produce an architecture project informed by a comprehensive program, from schematic design through the detailed development of programmatic spaces, structural and environmental systems, life-safety provisions, wall sections, and building assemblies, as may be appropriate; and to assess the completed project with respect to the program's design criteria.

From 2009 VTR: *The Matrix indicates that this criterion is fully met only by two courses: 4212 (B5 Building Systems Integration), which is given in the final term of the BEDS program, and 9008 (MARCH Thesis). The team found some evidence to conclude that the concept of comprehensive and integrated design was presented in course 4212, with the students using their own designs in the process. The team remains concerned that the design skills of BEDS*

students are not developed sufficiently to deal with a building encompassing all the systems involved in a truly comprehensive design. At the advanced level, after reviewing a wide selection of recent thesis reports, the team found sparse evidence of comprehensive design.

2015 Visiting Team Assessment:

This criterion is now met [refer to the assessment of SPC C4 *Comprehensive design* in the present VTR].

4. Program Strengths

1. **Programs' legibility.** A key strength of the School of Architecture is its strong legibility based on the synergistic relationship between a culture of making and a substantial investment towards the educational benefits of work terms. This legibility is celebrated throughout the curriculum, and is highly supported by the teaching faculty and program staff.
2. **Co-op program.** The co-op program is central to the education of Dalhousie architecture students, and grounds their educational experiences within the rigours and processes of practice. In addition, the work terms are successfully integrated into the curriculum in such a way as to appropriately underline lessons learned within the profession, while the delivery of the work term experience in two separate occasions facilitates the students' maturation process that allows them to contextualize course work strategically.
3. **Integration.** The focus on integration, at all studio levels, effected through the designed relationship between the delivery of courses centered on humanities, technology, representation, and professional practice and the translation of this knowledge as contributing to design intentions, solutions and forms, is commendable.
4. **Enrichment opportunities.** The School of Architecture offers a robust set of enrichment opportunities for the students and involve the integration of the broader design community. Included in this set are the lecture series, the professional practice week presentations that highlight design professionals, the student co-op program presentations, and the Dalhousie Architectural Press. These initiatives take much time and energy, and the School of Architecture is to be commended for these valuable initiatives.
5. **School commitment.** The School of Architecture is characterized by a faculty that is highly committed to teaching and engaging the students in the pursuit of learning opportunities. In addition, the faculty and staff are dedicated to fully delivering a curriculum within a context of restricted physical resources.
6. **Location.** The location of the School of Architecture in downtown Halifax brings much value to student life and learning, as well as grounding the institution of Dalhousie University within the cultural and social life of the city. The availability of urban amenities,

as well as being surrounded by stimulating urban fabric and cultural landscapes, makes the location an exceptional place to engage architectural culture.

7. **Institutional support.** The School of Architecture enjoys strong support from the Dalhousie University President and Provost/VP Academic. This support includes an understanding of the school's key role in defining a presence for the university within the downtown, as well as the school's contribution in defining the culture of design locally and regionally, and its commitment to community engagement.
8. **Collaboration.** The School of Architecture benefits from, and contributes to, a broader institutional network that includes the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, the Halifax Central Library, the Faculty of Engineering, and the Faculty of Agriculture.
9. **Community engagement.** Community engagement, framed primarily by the design/build culture of the Free Lab, provides students and faculty the important opportunity to connect with regional and international communities, and understand design as social and cultural agency, explored through appropriate technologies and methodologies.

5. Causes of Concern and Team's Recommendations

1. **Self-assessment.** Efforts by the School of Architecture towards curriculum renewal during the last few years, including the development of an integrated model for studio delivery, was effected by a number of key discussions, meetings, surveys, assessments, and decisions by faculty, independently or within committees and/or teaching groups. The Visiting Team recommends that this process be formalized into a rigorous and systematic methodology towards program self-assessment, including specific program and academic objectives, action items, timelines, and metrics for success.
2. **Access to digital infrastructure.** The access to information technologies needs to be improved. Access, in this case, is characterized by both the appropriate number of digital resources, including laser cutters, CNC machines, printing, and 3D printers, and more importantly, the systematic availability of trained technical staff that can facilitate a more seamless connection between the design process and the culture of making. As the demands for exploring and representing within a digital platform grow, the current stressed situation will become untenable. In the same manner that the traditional tools of hand drafting were always available for the architecture student to develop design ideas, digital tools need to be facilitated to a similar degree of accessibility.
3. **Physical resources.** The School of Architecture has been operating within a context of restricted physical resources for some time. The visiting team is aware of the planned delivery of the IDEA Building, to be built within a timeframe of 2 to 3 years, that together with the existing Medjuck Architecture Building and proposed renovated spaces within the engineering building, will form a pool of spaces that will address the future needs of the school. This initiative is supported and prioritized at the highest level, including the

endorsement of President Florizone and Provost/VP Academic Watters. However, in its current context, there is a great need for additional classroom space, workshop space, small meeting spaces, exhibition space, and space conducive for faculty research.

4. **Research diversity.** The School of Architecture has been, and continues to be, well regarded for its legibility based on the culture of making and craft, facilitated by the substantial presence and beneficial influence of faculty engaged in critical practice. That said, it is observed that alternative faculty research exploring other scholarly dimensions would be equally beneficial to the legibility of the school and the educational experiences of the students. In addition to diversifying the research and educational landscape in the school, this greater spectrum would offer opportunities for students in research assistantship and additional school legibility within the university's research portfolio.
5. **Integration balance.** The development of an integrated approach to the delivery of studio and course-based educational experiences has been well received by faculty as well as students. Evidence of the success of this model was observed in the exhibition of student work. That said, the Visiting Team acknowledges that course content needs to strike a clear balance between the legible and rigorous delivery of knowledge and its capacity to be integrated into the studio experience. Every course needs to have a clear autonomous pedagogical content.
6. **Study of human behaviour.** It was observed that student research into human behaviour would benefit from additional rigor and comprehensiveness. The Visiting Team acknowledges the importance of a studied approach towards the collecting, surveying, and understanding of human activities and the appropriate application within design contexts.
7. **Electives.** The visiting team acknowledges the importance of electives in providing both breadth and depth to the educational experience. In an effort to optimize the process of integration, it is important not to lose the value of meaningful electives and the manner in which they inform diverse perspectives.

III. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1. Program Response to the CACB Perspectives

Programs must respond to the relevant interests of the constituencies that make up the CACB: educators and regulators, as well as members of the practicing profession, students and interns, and the general public.

A. Architecture Education and the Academic Context

The program must demonstrate that it both benefits from and contributes to its institutional context.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

The School of Architecture benefits from being located in an exceptionally vibrant, active, and visible part of downtown Halifax, adjacent to the new Halifax Public Library. In this urban setting, the School of Architecture acts as the urban threshold to the rest of the Sexton campus.

The School of architecture also benefits from strong support at the highest level of university administration. The President and Provost/VP Academic both acknowledge the role of the School of architecture within Dalhousie University, as well as within Halifax. There is a good understanding of the overall interests, needs and opportunities associated with the school, as well as a high commitment and engagement towards the realization of the IDEA building.

Since the last accreditation visit, the dialogue between the Faculty's two schools seems to be strengthened by a common strategic plan. As well, collaboration continues with the Faculty of Engineering, through the shared use of workshops, and with the Faculty of Agriculture, with the development of new programs in Landscape architecture.

B. Architecture Education and the Students

The program must demonstrate that it provides support and encouragement for students to achieve their full potential during their school years and later in the profession, and that it provides an interpersonal milieu that embraces cultural differences.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

Within the program there is evidence of support and encouragement for students to achieve their full potential through unique experiences and opportunities, such as the Co-op Work terms, the Free Labs, the three different streams offered within the Masters program, and scholarships (internal and external). Free Labs strongly encourage collaborative work and provide a rich hands-on learning environment.

Visiting professors, through studios and lectures, introduce a variety of perspectives and models of practice. The integrated design studios propose a holistic approach that prepares students to the challenges encountered in the Work terms and the profession.

Students contribute to the shaping of programs by being involved in numerous academic committees, as well as by maintaining a supportive and engaging environment.

C. Architecture Education and Registration

The program must demonstrate that it provides students with a sound preparation for the transition to professional life, including internship and licensure.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

The program provides students with a sound preparation for the profession, largely due to the professional practice stream and its diverse pedagogical content. The professional practice week, the co-op work terms, and the Free Labs are innovative activities that prepare students for dealing with ethics, as well as with leadership and advocacy in the profession. Moreover, since most faculty members are practitioners or have a background in practice, students appear to have a high level of understanding of the profession, internship, as well as licensure.

The preparation and the review of term portfolios offer opportunities for students to develop skills in the documentation and presentation of their strengths and competencies through personal work.

D. Architecture Education and the Profession

The program must demonstrate how it prepares students to practice and assume new roles within a context of increasing cultural diversity, changing client and regulatory demands, and an expanding knowledge base.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

The program clearly prepares students for professional practice: the integrated studios and the professional practice stream are particularly effective in this regard, as are the strong connections that the program maintains with the City of Halifax and the Atlantic region.

There is however little evidence that the program addresses the evolving role of architecture in the context of cultural diversity, evolving client needs, changing regulatory frameworks and an expanding knowledge base. Projects tackled in the studios do not always reflect the realities of the profession, as expressed by a diversity

of programs, sites, users, contexts, cultural relevance, and overall global issues (such as the ageing of populations, universal accessibility, adaptive reuse, climate change, or First nations' needs).

E. Architecture Education and Society

The program must demonstrate that it equips students with an informed understanding of social and environmental problems and that it also develops their capacity to help address these problems with sound architecture and urban design decisions.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Through its strong local connections, the School of architecture equips the students with a clear understanding of social and environmental issues. Regional architecture is strongly valued and its qualities are embedded in the notion of making and handcrafting. This is also reflected in the level of community involvement by faculty members and students, as well as in the development of projects.

However, as mentioned above, the focused interest on regional issues and architecture may reduce students' exposure to more global and diverse social and economic challenges.

2. Program Self-assessment

The program must provide an assessment of the degree to which it is fulfilling its mission and achieving its action plan.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

There is evidence of curricular evolution and development, specifically towards integration, which was facilitated and structured through a number of key discussions, meetings, surveys, assessments, and decisions by faculty, independently or within committees and/or teaching groups. In addition, at the faculty level, a strategic plan entitled "Faculty of Architecture and Planning: Strategic Plan (2013-2018)" was developed through the full involvement of the architecture faculty and other stakeholders, with specific action items defined for the School of Architecture. From these initiatives, the Visiting Team recommends that a formal and systematic program self-assessment process specific to the School of Architecture be developed. This process should include specific program and academic objectives, action items, timelines, and metrics for success necessary to address the school's academic development and key challenges in terms of physical, financial, human, and IT resources [refer to Cause of concern #1 in the present VTR].

3. Public Information

The program must provide clear, complete, and accurate information to the public by including in its academic calendar and promotional literature the exact language found in Appendix A-1, which explains the parameters of an accredited professional degree program.

Met Not Met
 [] [X]

Team Assessment:

- The exact language of Appendix A-1 has been found on the School’s web site, under *Prospective students / Architecture as a career* (reference to that appendix and quotation marks are however missing). Strangely, the exact language of Appendix A-1 has not been found under *Current students / Accreditation*. Recent Graduate Calendars (2014-2015, 2013-2014, 2012-2013), as well as some admission material that the team consulted^a, do not systemically present the exact language found in the Appendix A-1^b.
- There are ambiguities about the degree that is actually accredited by the CACB. It should be clear that the MArch program constitutes the first-professional degree program, and not the “BEDS/MArch program” (as it appears on the web site^c and in recent academic calendars). Expressions like “We are also accredited by the [CACB]” are also ambiguous^d.
- Proof that the *2012 Guide to Student Performance Criteria* was distributed to students and faculty has been provided (copies of emails in the *2014 APR*, page 28). Evidence has not been found that current and previous *APRs* and *VTRs* have been stored according to article 5.3.1^e of the *CACB 2012 Procedures for Accreditation*, about Public Disclosure of Accreditation Outcomes.

4. Social Equity

The accredited degree program must provide a summary of provincial and institutional policies that augment and clarify the provisions of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms as they apply to social equity. Where policies in place are specific to the School or professional program, these should be clearly stated, as well as the means by which they are communicated to current and prospective faculty, students and staff.

Met Not Met
 [X] []

a See for instance: Future Prospects in Architecture (for high school students) (<http://tinyurl.com/nw9hd5f>); Professional Architecture Program (for prospective BEDS students) (<http://tinyurl.com/nbptqfh>); Frequently Asked Questions (for prospective BEDS students) (<http://tinyurl.com/payrv5f>).

b See for instance section 4.8 of the *2014 Architecture Program Report* (pages 357-368).

c <http://architectureandplanning.dal.ca/architecture/prospective/career.shtml> (Web site consulted on February 6, 2015 and on March 10, 2015).

d http://www.dal.ca/academics/programs/undergraduate/architecture/program_overview.html (Web site consulted on February 6, 2015 and on March 10, 2015).

e “5.3.1 After the CACB accreditation decision, the Program is required to disseminate the *APR*, the final *VTR* and any pertinent attachments, the current version of the *CACB Conditions and Terms for Accreditation* and *Procedures for Accreditation* and, eventually, the *AR(s)* that are written to maintain accreditation. These documents must be housed together in the architecture library and be made freely accessible to students, faculty, administration, and the public” (*CACB 2012 Procedures for Accreditation*).

Team Assessment:

Dalhousie University's collective agreement (Dalhousie Faculty Association) as well as policies on employment and gender equity (*Employment equity through affirmative action*) prohibit discrimination and ensure fairness in faculty and student progress. The School's *Admission requirements* also advertise Dalhousie's policies (2014 APR, sections 3.4.2).

By relying on university policies, the School of Architecture recognizes the need for gender equity within the faculty (2014 APR, sections 3.4.2 and 3.4.3). Future hiring should thus reflect efforts to increase the faculty's diversity.

Students are actively involved in many different committees: Program, Teaching groups, Admissions (BEDS and MArch), Year End Review, Faculty searches (2014 APR, section 3.10.5).

In view of the widely publicized events that occurred within the Faculty of Dentistry in 2014, the FAP and the School of Architecture have taken sensible and sensitive steps to openly discuss discrimination issues with staff, faculty and students (as stated by Director Burnay on March 10, 2015).

5. Human Resources

The program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient faculty complement, an administrative head devoting not less than fifty percent of his/her time to program administration, administrative and technical support staff, and faculty support staff. Student enrolment in and scheduling of, design studios must assure adequate time for an effective tutorial exchange between the faculty member and the student. A maximum student/faculty ratio between 12:1 and 15:1 is considered acceptable. The total teaching load should be such that faculty members have adequate time to pursue research, scholarship, and practice to enhance their professional development.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

The School of Architecture has a faculty complement of 12 tenured faculty members and 1 tenure-stream faculty. In addition, the school has three part-time professors of practice, and two other teaching staff: a Senior Instructor/Technician and a Lecturer/Technical Coordinator. Tenure and tenure-stream faculty are expected to calibrate their overall commitment with 40% teaching, 40% research, and 20% administration. Currently, the school is operating with a total FTE of 12.75, with two planned faculty searches in the upcoming year. Three administrative releases and one secondment reduce the school's net teaching capacity, a condition that is addressed through the use of sessional and part-time teaching. The use of both full-time and part-time teaching in studios maintains an appropriate student to instructor ratio, and also meets the requirement for effective tutorial exchange. Finally, Director Burnay manages an adequate administrative release of 50%.

The staff is a dedicated and thoughtful team of administrators and technicians strongly attached to the school and the university. They are committed to make the school a supportive and enjoyable environment for everyone, especially the students. However, there are some areas of concern. The replacement of senior staff is imminent. One key technician in the workshop with 35 years experience is set to retire in April 2015. As well, the school currently employs students as assistants to alleviate the workload in periods of heavy demand. This practice can be problematic due to the unreliability of this short-term solution as well as being perceived as undervaluing staff's expertise. Further, increased communication and collegiality with faculty may help bridge what is felt as a communication disjuncture. Involving the staff in planning the year's academic activities could help streamline some processes.

Additional help and expertise is required to facilitate the students' access to digital infrastructure [refer to Cause of concern #2 in the present VTR].

6. Human Resource Development

Programs must have a clear policy outlining both individual and collective opportunities for faculty and student growth within and outside the program.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

Dalhousie University has institutional policies for appointment, tenure, and promotion, including the evaluation of research and practice activities, the offering of sabbatical leaves, and other relevant policies that guide faculty development. The Visiting Team found the definition of scholarly research within university policy to be appropriate for an architecture school and a professional faculty, and that the Faculty of Architecture and Planning has appropriate control of the execution of these policies. In addition to these policies, the university and faculty collectively offer other support such as funding for travel, conference attendance, a small annual professional development allowance, and a faculty research development fund for new faculty.

Students in the School of Architecture enjoy both formal, policy-centered opportunities that are comparable to other accredited programs in Canada, as well as a robust offering of enrichment opportunities towards growth and development. From a policy perspective, university student support services adequately offer academic advising, counselling, and career assistance. Within the school and faculty itself, student opportunities and development include an excellent lecture series, an engaged dialogue with the local, regional, and international architectural community through studio reviews, portfolio reviews, and professional practice fora, extensive field trips, two work terms, an exchange program with two international schools of architecture, and a tradition of design/build. Finally, the students are active and engaged within the decision-making practice of the school, as well as within their student association.

7. Physical Resources

The program must provide physical resources that are appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each full-time student; lecture and seminar spaces that accommodate both didactic and interactive learning; office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member; and related instructional support space.

Met Not Met
 [] [X]

Team Assessment:

The identification of the School of Architecture’s limited and compromised access to physical resources have been previously cited in numerous reports, and confirmed through the observations and interviews carried out by the Visiting Team. In referencing the existing school facilities, the *Faculty of Architecture and Planning Self Study* (2007) states “... the building is simply too small to accommodate all of our program and their staff, faculty, and students.” The 2009 Visiting Team Report, under the subheading of Concern, suggests that the “... school requires additional space for lectures, classes, reviews, exhibitions and informal meetings. In a program dedicated to the process of making, it is clear that the shops and fabrication facilities need to be expanded.” Finally, the Faculty of Architecture and Planning, Dalhousie University, Strategic Plan 2013-2018 states that the “... teaching, learning and office space available to us on the Sexton Campus is insufficient to properly support our programs or plan for growth. Inadequate workshop facilities limit the ability of the architecture school to compete in innovation in the discipline.”

It is clear to the Visiting Team that the faculty, staff, and leadership group are doing everything they can to deliver the curriculum and educational experiences. As well, the team is aware of the planned delivery of the IDEA Building, to be built within a suggested timeline of 2 to 3 years, and that this initiative is supported and prioritized at the highest level, including the endorsement of President Florizone and Provost/VP Academic Watters. However, in the current context, there is a great need for additional classroom space, review space, workshop space, small meeting spaces, exhibition space, and space conducive to faculty research. As well, although new operable windows have done much to improve the conditioned environment in the school, there remain challenges with the extreme temperature fluctuations in winter and summer.

8. Information Resources and information technology

The architecture librarian and, if appropriate, the staff member in charge of visual resource or other non-book collections must prepare a self-assessment demonstrating the adequacy of the architecture library.

For Information Technology Resources, the program must also provide the information technology infrastructure and corresponding staff support in order to effectively contribute to the delivery of the curriculum, as well as supporting activities of staff and faculty.

Met Not Met
 [X] []

Team Assessment:

Information resources

The library is located on the Sexton Campus in close proximity to the Medjuck Architecture Building:

- Funding for book purchases and journal subscriptions has fluctuated a great deal since the last accreditation visit: from \$46,000 to \$50,000 between 2010 and 2011, rising to \$57,000 in 2012, falling to \$3,000 in 2013, and increasing to \$35,000 in 2014.
- Collections include a wide range of subjects: design, history, theory, criticism, urban design, preservation and restoration, housing, computer applications, community design, and professional practice. They have grown from an estimated 28,000 volumes in 2003 to 36,000 in 2014. Periodicals are present in appropriate variety and number.
- The Medjuck Architecture Building houses a Resource Centre which contains an extensive collection of slides and digital images covering ancient through modern architecture, as well as maps. The digitization of the slide collection is ongoing.
- In terms of physical facilities however, the Sexton Library “needs help” (as stated by a student at the entrance meeting with students, March 9, 2015). It has been observed that study space is relegated to large desks and work stations in the open areas of the library without concern for noise disturbance, that there is a lack of private study carrels, and that there is excessive heat temperature fluctuations on the mezzanine. In many cases, students do not want to work in the library. Renovations to the reception area are imminent.
- The library portal is well organized. The consulting staff is helpful and provides on-demand initiation to documentary research and on-line resources.

Information technology (IT)

The School of architecture has five computer labs at its disposal, which are distributed through the Medjuck Architecture Building (open 24 hours per day, 7 days a week). The university provides for the computers and the software updates. The Medjuck building is equipped with a high-speed wireless network, and all classrooms are provided with Internet connections and connections close to studio areas.

It has been confirmed that there is no formal IT Action Plan at the Faculty or School level: “IT is handled largely at the university level, by Information Technology Services (ITS). There is a 2014 ITS Strategic Plan” (email from Program director Parcell, dated March 9, 2015, to the Team chair, and then forwarded to team members).

The Visiting Team has observed that access to information technologies must be improved both in terms of digital resources and the availability of trained technical staff [refer to Cause of concern #2 in the present VTR].

9. Financial Resources

Programs must have access to sufficient institutional support and financial resources.

Met Not Met
 [X] []

Team Assessment:

Overall, the School of architecture enjoys a steady financial state in spite of Dalhousie University's annual 3% budget cut (2014 APR, page 2). This relative stability stems from the strategic redistribution of salary allocations as a result of faculty retirement (Kroeker), resignation (Hudson) and secondment (Mannell). That being said, the financial restraints apply to the School's discretionary budget that funds adjuncts and guest lecturers, as well as *ad hoc* research and professional activities. Financial resources available to support the program include:

- Healthy endowments, mainly used for student scholarships and bursaries at both BEDS and MArch levels (some endowments are shared with Planning, Engineering and/or Computer Sciences).
- Funds for certain research and professional activities such as travel expenses to attend conferences.
- An allocation of \$75 per student for attending the Free Labs. Further funding for design/build activities taking place outside of Nova Scotia or Canada has to be secured by participating faculty. While few members of the Faculty have secured tri-council research funding, they should be encouraged and supported in applying for scholarly grants.
- With a longer view towards development and new revenues, the Faculty of Architecture and Planning is developing two new programs: a Bachelor of Community Design (BCD) and a Master of Landscape Architecture (MLA) in conjunction with the Faculty of Agriculture which recently joined Dalhousie University. In this context, new non-studio courses will be offered (as confirmed by Dean Macy, March 9, 2015). Meanwhile, the BEDS and MArch programs are intended to remain the same size.

10. Administrative Structure (Academic Unit & Institution)

The program must be part of, or be, an institution accredited by a recognized accrediting agency for higher education. The program must have a degree of autonomy that is both comparable to that afforded to the other relevant professional programs in the institution and sufficient to assure conformance with all the conditions for accreditation.

Met Not Met
 [X] []

Team Assessment:

The administrative structures of Dalhousie University and of the Faculty of Architecture and Planning are fully recognized and accredited. Within this academic setting, the School of Architecture benefits from a degree of autonomy comparable to the other professional faculties of the university. Director Burnay heads the School of Architecture and works

collegially with Dean Macy. The director's administrative duties are well defined and effectively conducted, as are those of the dean. Within the Faculty of Architecture and Planning, the two schools enjoy their autonomy.

11. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

The CACB awards accreditation only to first-professional degree programs in architecture.

These include:

- *Master of Architecture degree with a related pre-professional bachelor's degree; requirement, typically amounting to five or six years of study;*
- *Master of Architecture degree without a pre-professional requirement, consisting of an undergraduate degree plus a minimum of three years of professional studies.*
- *Bachelor of Architecture degree requiring a minimum of five years of study, except in Quebec, where four years of professional studies follows two years of CEGEP studies*

The curricular requirements for awarding these degrees must include three components: general studies, professional studies, and electives that respond to the needs of the institution, the architecture profession, and the students respectively.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

The professional degrees offered at Dalhousie's School of Architecture comply with this CACB condition: a Master of Architecture (MArch) with a related pre-professional bachelor's degree (BEDS). That being said, two concerns should be noted:

- According to the 2014 APR (section 3.11.1, page 96), the credit/hours for the professional curriculum (BEDS + MArch) amount to 62%, a ratio slightly exceeding the CACB specified balance of 60% (with 40% of general studies or electives). This points to the fact that the curriculum offers an insufficient number of electives.
- The BEDS program offers no electives, which may reduce students' access to a broader range of subjects and issues.

12. Student Performance Criteria (SPC)

Each architecture program must ensure that all its graduates possess the skills and knowledge defined by the performance criteria set out below, which constitute the minimum requirements for meeting the demands of an internship leading to registration for practice. The program must provide evidence that all its graduates have satisfied each criterion through required course work.

A1. Critical Thinking Skills

Ability to raise clear and precise questions, use abstract ideas to interpret information, consider diverse points of view, reach well reasoned conclusions, and test them against relevant criteria and standards.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

Evidence was found in Design studios (notably B5/4005), in Thesis work (including preparation M5/9007), history and theory courses (B5/4111), as well as the process portfolio elaborated as part of the BEDS integrated coursework.

A2. Research Skills

Ability to employ basic methods of data collection and analysis to inform all aspects of the programming and design process.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

This criterion is met in history and theory courses (B5/4111), mostly in the form of documentary research or literary investigation, as well as in Thesis preparation (M5/9007) and Thesis (M6/9008).

A3. Graphic Skills

Ability to employ appropriate representational media to convey essential formal elements at each stage of the programming and design process.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

Student work in both studios and academic courses show evidence of graphic skills in hand drawing, in line with the School's tradition and dedication in that regard. There is also evidence of diverse media use, including digital modeling and rendering.

A4. Verbal and Writing Skills

Ability to speak and write effectively on subject matter contained in the professional curriculum.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

This criterion is met in diverse academic and studio contexts: in the history and theory courses (B3/4110; B5/4111), in studios (in the form of project statements for B5/4005), and Thesis work (M6/9008).

A5. Collaborative Skills

Ability to identify and assume divergent roles that maximize individual talents, and to cooperate with others when working as members of a design team and in other settings.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

This criterion is met. Throughout the curriculum, students do teamwork in small and larger groups, both in studio settings (BEDS/MArch) and courses (B3/4211; B5/4111). The Free Lab (B4/4004) provides unique and reliable opportunities to conduct meaningful collaborations with and within communities.

A6. Human Behavior

Understanding of the relationship between human behavior, the natural environment and the design of the built environment.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

The criterion is met in the combined curriculum of the history and theory classes (B2/3105; B5/4111). However, tangible understanding of users' relationship to their environment is less evident in the studio work (B2/3002; B5/4005). Basic and rigorous methods of inquiry and analysis of data collected on site, for instance, could help students make sense of the use and practice of space towards the resolution of studio projects.

A7. Cultural Diversity

Understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioral norms, and social/spatial patterns that characterize different cultures and individuals, as well as the implications of this diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects.

Met	Not Met
[]	[X]

Team Assessment:

In the specified coursework (B2/3105; B5/4111), human and cultural diversity is predominantly considered within the context of European, North European and regional preoccupations. Although some courses feature pedagogical content related to this SPC, they are electives. This situation may narrow students' access to different cultures and ways to consider their multifaceted roles as architects in contemporary society.

A8. History and Theory

Understanding of diverse global and local traditions in architecture, landscape, and urban design, as well as the factors that have shaped them.

Met	Not Met
[X]	[]

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *understanding* was found in the BEDS history and theory classes (B2/3105; B3/4110; B5/4111).

A9. Precedents

Ability to make a comprehensive analysis and evaluation of a building, building complex, or urban space.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

There is convincing evidence of the use of architectural precedents and case studies in the history and theory courses (B3/4110; B5/4111), as well as in Thesis preparation (M6/9007).

B1. Design Skills

Ability to apply organizational, spatial, structural, and constructional principles to the conception and development of spaces, building elements, and tectonic components.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *ability* has been found in all studios within the BEDS and Masters streams.

B2. Program Preparation

Ability to prepare a comprehensive program for an architectural project that accounts for client and user needs, appropriate precedents, space and equipment requirements, the relevant laws and standards, and site selection and design assessment criteria.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *ability* has been found in B5 with some sporadic evidence in M6 Thesis.

B3. Site Design

Ability to analyze and respond to context and site conditions in the development of a program and in the design of a project.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *ability* has been found in B2 Studio, B5 Studio, and M6 Thesis. Although the site analysis was present in terms of spatial structure, there was less evidence of rigorous analysis of issues pertaining to human occupation.

B4. Sustainable Design

Ability to apply the principles of sustainable design to produce projects that conserve natural and built resources, provide healthy environments for occupants/users, and reduce the impacts of building construction and operations on future generations.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *ability* was found in B5 Studio and its partner Building Systems Integration 4212.

B5. Accessibility

Ability to design both site and building to accommodate individuals with varying physical and cognitive abilities.

Met Not Met
[] [X]

Team Assessment:

No evidence of a systematic development of accessible design was observed in the design work. As well, there was no mention of course objectives or exercises related to accessibility in the course outlines.

B6. Life Safety Systems, Building Codes and Standards

Understanding the principles that inform the design and selection of life-safety systems in buildings and their subsystems; the codes, regulations, and standards applicable to a given site and building design project, including occupancy classifications, allowable building heights and areas, allowable construction types, separation requirements, occupancy requirements, means of egress, fire protection, and structure.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *understanding* has been found in Professional Practice 5311.

B7. Structural Systems

Understanding of the principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravity and lateral forces, and the evolution, range and appropriate applications of structural systems.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

This criterion is met through Design (B3/4003; B5/4005), as well as through Building Systems Integration 4211 and 4212.

B8. Environmental Systems

Understanding of the basic principles that inform the design of environmental systems, including acoustics, illumination and climate modification systems, building envelopes, and energy use with awareness of the appropriate performance assessment tools.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *understanding* has been found in Building Systems Integration 4212.

B9. Building Envelopes

Understanding of the basic principles involved in the appropriate application of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, moisture transfer, durability, and energy and material resources.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *understanding* has been found in Building Systems Integration 4212.

B10. Building Service Systems

Understanding of the basic principles that inform the design of building service systems, including plumbing, electrical, vertical transportation, communication, security, and fire protection systems.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *understanding* has been found in Building Systems Integration 4212

B11. Building Materials and Assemblies

Understanding of the basic principles utilized in the appropriate selection of construction materials, products, components, and assemblies, based on their inherent characteristics and performance.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *understanding* has been found in Building Systems Integration 4211 and 4212.

B12. Building Economics and Cost Control

Understanding of the fundamentals of development financing, building economics, construction cost control, and life-cycle cost accounting.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

This criterion is met through Professional Practice 4304.

C1. Detailed Design Development

Ability to assess and detail as an integral part of the design, appropriate combinations of building materials, components, and assemblies.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *ability* was found in B5 Studio and Building Systems Integration 4211 and 4212.

C2. Building Systems Integration

Ability to assess, select, and integrate structural systems, environmental systems, life safety systems, building envelopes, and building service systems into building design.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *ability* was found in B5 Studio 4005 and Building Systems Integration 4212.

C3. Technical Documentation

Ability to make technically precise descriptions and documentation of a proposed design for purposes of review and construction.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *ability* was found in B5 Studio 4005.

C4. Comprehensive Design

Ability to project a comprehensive design based on an architectural idea, a building program and a site. The design or designs should integrate structural and environmental systems, building envelopes, building assemblies, life-safety provisions, and environmental stewardship.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *ability* was found in B5 Studio 4005.

D1. Leadership and Advocacy

Understanding of the techniques and skills for architects to work collaboratively with allied disciplines, clients, consultants, builders, and the public in the building design and construction process, and to advocate on environmental, social, and aesthetic issues in their communities.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

This criterion is met in Professional Practice 3302, 4304 and 5311, as well as through Co-op Work Terms 5308 and 5309.

D2. Ethics and Professional Judgment

Understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment regarding social, political and cultural issues in architectural design and practice.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

This criterion is met through Co-op Work Terms 5308 and 5309. It is also met through Thesis 9008.

D3. Legal Responsibilities

Understanding of the architect's responsibility to the client and the public under the laws, codes, regulations and contracts common to the practice of architecture in a given jurisdiction.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

Evidence of *understanding* has been found in Co-op Work Terms 5308 and 5309, as well as in Professional Practice 3302 and 4303 (courses provided through the Professional Practice week).

D4. Project Delivery

Understanding of the different methods of project delivery, the corresponding forms of service contracts, and the types of documentation required to render competent and responsible professional service.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

There was no evidence demonstrated in Co-op Work Terms 5308 and 5309. However, the criterion is met through Professional Practice 4303.

D5. Practice Organization

Understanding of the basic principles of practice organization, including financial management, business planning, marketing, negotiation, project management, risk mitigation and as well as an understanding of trends that affect practice.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

The criterion is met through Professional Practice 4303.

D6. Professional Internship

Understanding of the role of internship in professional development, and the reciprocal rights and responsibilities of interns and employers.

Met Not Met
[X] []

Team Assessment:

The criterion is met through Co-op Work Terms 5308 and 5309. There was however no evidence demonstrated in Professional Practice 3302, 4304 and 5311 (as suggested by the Matrix).

IV. Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

The following is condensed from the Program's *Architecture Program Report*, except for 5. Program Action Plan which is a document provided by Director Burnay (dated March 10, 2015) during the visit as supplementary information requested by the Visiting Team

1. Brief History of Dalhousie University

Dalhousie University was founded in 1818 by George Ramsay, ninth Earl of Dalhousie, who resided at Dalhousie Castle near Edinburgh and also served as Lieutenant-Governor of Nova Scotia. He wanted the new college to be modeled on the university in Edinburgh, as an institution that would be open to all, regardless of class or creed. Soon after the college was founded, Lord Dalhousie was appointed Governor-General of Canada and left Halifax. Without his influence, the college faltered. The first instruction was offered in 1838 but the college operated only intermittently. It was later reorganized, and in 1863 reopened with six professors and one tutor. The first three degrees were awarded in 1866. The student body in that year consisted of 28 degree students and 28 occasional students.

The original site of the college was on the Grand Parade in downtown Halifax, where City Hall now stands. In 1886, the university moved to the Forrest Building, which is now part of the Carleton Campus, and gradually spread west to form the Studley Campus. In 1997, following the amalgamation of Dalhousie University and the Technical University of Nova Scotia (with its Faculties of Architecture and Engineering and its School of Computer Science), the Sexton Campus was added. Dalhousie University grew throughout the twentieth century, becoming Nova Scotia's largest university.

Following the 1997 Dalhousie/TUNS amalgamation, provincial legislation created a college, nicknamed "DalTech," to oversee academic, administrative, and research activities in Architecture, Engineering, and Computer Science. In 2000 the college structure was dissolved, with the Faculty of Architecture and the Faculty of Engineering becoming simply Faculties in the University, alongside Arts and Social Sciences, Computer Science, Dentistry, Health Professions, Law, Management, Medicine, Science, and Graduate Studies. In 2001 the Faculty of Architecture was renamed the Faculty of Architecture and Planning.

In 2012 the Nova Scotia Agricultural College merged with Dalhousie University to become the Faculty of Agriculture, bringing the number of Faculties to twelve.

2. Institutional Mission

In 2013 Dalhousie University appointed a new president, Richard Florizone. He spent his first hundred days listening to various constituents throughout the university. This led to a report,

100 Days of Listening (<http://tinyurl.com/m38zov8>), which in turn informed another document, *Strategic Direction 2014–2018* (<http://tinyurl.com/njcv7k2>) that was approved by the Board of Governors in June 2014.

Mission:

- To foster an environment of teaching and learning excellence, built on innovation, collaboration, and respect;
- To create a hub of world-leading research and innovation, adding to the intellectual, social, and economic capital of our communities;
- To facilitate opportunities for our students, staff, and faculty to connect with and serve our local, national, and global communities.

Vision: Dalhousie is a leading innovative, research-intensive university, inspiring our diverse scholarly community to serve Nova Scotia, our region, our nation and the world.

Strategic Priorities:

- Teaching and Learning: Enhance the transformative power of teaching and learning.
- Research: Expand the opportunities for research, scholarly and artistic work.
- Service: Catalyze the intellectual, social and economic development of our communities.
- Partnerships and reputation: Take our place nationally and internationally.
- Infrastructure and support: Build our institutional capacities.

3. Program History

The School of Architecture was established within the Nova Scotia Technical College in 1961, sharing the building on Spring Garden Road with the Nova Scotia Museum of Science. During the 1960s the professional architecture program started with two years of engineering at one of seven Maritime universities, followed by four years at the School of Architecture, leading to a Bachelor of Architecture degree. In 1969, the engineering prerequisite was changed to two years in any university subject.

In 1970 the provincial museum moved out, the School of Architecture took over the entire building, and the trimester system and co-op work term program were initiated. In 1973 the architecture portion of the professional program included a two-year pre-professional degree (eventually called Bachelor of Environmental Design Studies) and a two-year professional Bachelor of Architecture degree. The BArch program was validated by the Commonwealth Association of Architects, and a one-year, post-professional Master of Architecture program was first offered. In 1976 the Faculty of Architecture was established, with the School of Architecture continuing as a constituent part of the Faculty. The Master of Urban and Rural Planning program was first offered in 1977, and in 1978 the Department of Urban and Rural Planning was established within the Faculty of Architecture.

In 1980 the Nova Scotia Technical College became the Technical University of Nova Scotia. In the

mid-1980s the professional program was transformed, leading to a two-year Master of Architecture (First Professional) degree with a graduate thesis component. The School began to participate in overseas activities with the International Laboratory for Architecture and Urban Design (ILAUD), and adjunct professors and external examiners from various countries and fields were appointed. In the late 1980s the Faculty opened a publishing department, Tuns Press (renamed Dalhousie Architectural Press in 2013), which continues to produce architecture and planning publications. In 1989 a one-year, non-professional Master of Environmental Design Studies degree was first offered.

In 1994 the professional architecture program became the first in Canada to receive accreditation from the Canadian Architectural Certification Board. Accreditation was granted again in 1999, 2004, and 2009. In 1997, a decision by the Nova Scotia government to amalgamate universities led the three faculties of the Technical University of Nova Scotia (Architecture, Engineering, and a new Faculty of Computer Science) to become part of Dalhousie University.

4. Program Mission

The mission statement from 2002 is still an accurate summary of the School's priorities:

- to educate students in the discipline of architecture, understood as the craft of projecting and making built environments;
- to prepare graduates to take on an engaged and committed stance to the advancement of the profession of architecture;
- to work in the community, using Atlantic Canada as a laboratory for development of specific and authentic practices of architecture;
- to extend the reach of architecture: as a cultural practice, and as a force in culture and society.

5. Program Action Plan

Curricular Assessment and Development

Note: Document provided by Director Burnay (dated March 10, 2015) as Supplementary information requested by the Visiting Team, during the visit.

Introduction

Curricular assessment and development in the Architecture program is an iterative and cyclical process. It involves review, evaluation, goal-setting, changes, and development. It is an integral part of the administrative and operational structures of the Architecture program that takes place at regular intervals: each term, each year, during cyclical reviews, and when prompted by internal or external factors.

Curriculum reviews are highly participatory. They involve faculty, students, and external examiners. They include reflection not only on curricular goals, but also learning outcomes that are evident in students' work, especially their process portfolios.

Review and Evaluation

Each term includes regular meetings for four levels of academic committees: Teaching Groups (Design, Humanities, Technology, and Professional Practice), Term Committees (B1–M5), Program Committee, and School of Architecture. The Director and all faculty are members of most committees, so there is considerable overlap and communication. Wednesday afternoons throughout the year are reserved for meetings.

In the four Teaching Groups, instructors report on just-completed courses and describe plans for upcoming courses. During the past year they have also been mapping and comparing learning objectives in all BEDS/MArch courses. So far, this has led to a reorganization of the content and structure of the Professional Practice stream, including attention to the CACB SPCs. Similar work in the three other streams is still in progress. The Professional Practice Group also approves all co-op work term placements for the BEDS and MArch work terms. The Term Committees meet periodically to discuss how the various courses in the next term are integrated in their content and coordinated in their scheduling.

The Program Committee (the Director, the chairs of the four teaching groups, and a student rep) also meets several times each term to discuss broader curriculum issues and to consider instructors' proposed structural changes in an upcoming term (e.g., co-requisite courses, field trips, and modular schedules). It also checks upcoming course outlines to ensure that they are complete and coordinated.

The School of Architecture committee meets several times each term. One of its responsibilities is to approve new undergraduate and graduate courses before they are forwarded to the Faculty of Architecture and Planning or the Faculty of Graduate Studies for final approval. It also reviews and approves all student grades at the end of each term and considers any anomalies for individual students or entire courses.

Each year, at the end of the winter term, there is a full day of Year 3 portfolio reviews (for B1–B2 courses) and a full day of Year 4 portfolio reviews (for B3–B5 courses). Both the student work and the curriculum are discussed by the instructors who teach in those years, as well as a student rep and an external examiner who later submits a written report to the School.

Immediately following the winter and summer MArch thesis examinations, the thesis supervisors and external examiners discuss both the student work and the thesis curriculum. The external thesis examiners are appointed for a five-year term, which enables them to observe longer-term changes and offer longer-term recommendations for consideration by the teaching groups.

Cyclical reviews take place on a roughly six-year cycle. This includes the CACB review of the professional Architecture program (1994, 1999, 2004, 2009, and 2015) and the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Senate Reviews of the Faculty of Architecture and Planning (2007 and 2015).

Occasional reviews take place in response to internal or external factors. Examples include the

restructuring of the BEDS/M. Arch program in 2005; the merging of the Design and Representation teaching groups in 2011; a two-day Humanities curriculum review with an external examiner in 2013; terms of reference for comprehensive studios in B5, M1, and M2; plans for integrated terms in B1, B2, B3, and B5; recent plans for a Heritage Conservation initiative; actions to support the goals and timeline in the Faculty of Architecture and Planning Strategic Plan (2013); and future Architecture course support for a non-professional Bachelor of Community Design program in urban studies in the Faculty.

Measuring Success and Setting Goals

To measure success in individual courses and in each stream, all course outlines specify learning objectives. To measure success in BEDS Year 3 and Year 4 portfolios, two School documents ("Expectations of a Year 3 [or 4] Design Portfolio") are posted on the website (<http://tinyurl.com/lzd84gs> and <http://tinyurl.com/o7gsqzv>) and used as a reference by the committees during the year-end reviews.

The BEDS program has been the main curricular focus during the past several years, focusing on learning objectives. The teaching groups have begun to analyze MArch courses in a similar way, using a large matrix in each stream.

Curricular goals are initiated mainly within each teaching group, then discussed at the higher committee levels.

Change and Development

Change and development can be initiated either "bottom-up" (by the teaching groups) or "top-down" (by the Director or School of Architecture Committee). All initiatives proceed through a participatory process that includes students, faculty members, teaching groups, the Director, and sometimes the Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies, or Senate, as required by University governance.

Impetus for change may include self-evaluation processes (described above); changing contexts (financial, etc.); new opportunities or resources (departmental affiliations, external alliances, etc.); faculty or student initiatives; or an impetus from the profession, the university, or other sources.

Curriculum changes are always evaluated by the appropriate teaching group(s) (Design, Humanities, Technology, or Professional Practice), largely by considering their impact on student experience, knowledge, and abilities.

Appendix B: The Visiting Team

Chair	Myriam Blais École d'architecture, Université Laval 1, côte de la Fabrique, bureau 3229 Québec (Québec) G1R 3V6 Tel: (418) 656-2131 poste 3206 E-mail: myriam.blais@arc.ulaval.ca	Educator
Members	Marc Boutin University of Calgary Faculty of Environmental Design 2500 University Drive NW Calgary (Alberta) T2N 1N4 Tel: (403) 261-9050. E-mail: boutin@ucalgary.ca	Educator / Practitioner
	Brian Gregersen WGD ARCHITECTS INC 250 The Esplanade Suite 302 Toronto (Ontario) M5A 1J2 Tel: (416) 595-9955 E-mail: bgregersen@rogers.com	Practitioner
	Geneviève Vachon École d'architecture, Université Laval 1, côte de la Fabrique, bureau 3231A Québec (Québec) G1R 3V6 Tel: (418) 656-2131, poste 6762 E-mail: Genevieve.Vachon@arc.ulaval.ca	Educator
	Rachelle Lemieux Stantec Architecture 905 Waverley Street Winnipeg (Manitoba) R3T 5P4 Tel: (204) 489-5900 ext. 843 E-mail: Rachelle.Lemieux@stantec.com	Intern
Observer	Odile Roy Service de l'aménagement du territoire, Ville de Québec 295, boulevard Charest Est, bureau 162 Québec (Québec) G1K 3G8 Tel: (418) 641-6411, poste 2120 E-mail: roy.rocheleau@videotron.ca	

Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

Day	Start	Duration	Event	Team members	Dalhousie reps	Location		
Saturday	March 7	PM	until 12:54	Visiting Team members arrive in Halifax	all		Airport	
			until 2:00	Visiting Team members check in at the hotel	all		Lord Nelson Hotel	
			02:00	01:30 Team-only lunch; introductions and orientation	all		Lord Nelson Hotel	
			03:30	:30 Entrance meeting with Director	all	Burnay	Lord Nelson Hotel	
			04:00	:30 Overview of the team room (including exhibition)	all	Burnay, Parcell	School - team room	
			04:30	01:00 Tour of the facilities	all	Burnay, Parcell, Jannasch	School	
			05:30	01:30 APR review and assembly of issues and questions	all		School - team room	
			07:00	02:00 Team-only dinner	all		restaurant TBA	
			09:00	01:30 APR review and assembly of issues and questions	all		School - team room or hotel	
			Sunday	March 8	AM	07:30	01:30 Team-only working breakfast	all
09:00	03:30 Initial review of exhibits and records	all					School - team room	
PM	17:30	01:30 Team lunch (catered) with Director and Undergrad/Graduate Coordinator				all	Burnay, Parcell	School - team room
02:00	02:00 Entrance meeting with faculty	all				all faculty	School - team room	
04:00	01:00 Faculty introduction to design work in the exhibition	all				all faculty	School - team room	
05:00	02:00 Continued review of exhibits and records	all					School - team room	
07:00	02:00 Team-only dinner	all					restaurant TBA	
09:00	Debriefing session	all					School - team room or hotel	
Monday	March 9	AM				06:30	01:30 Team working breakfast with the Director	all
			08:00	:15 (travel from hotel to Hicks Administration Building)	all		by taxi	
			08:30	01:00 Entrance meeting with the President and Provost/VP Academic	all	Richard Horzone, Carolyn Watters	President's Office	
			09:30	01:00 Entrance meeting with Dean of Graduate Studies and Associate VP Academic	all	Marty Leonard, Fiona Black	Lord Dalhousie Room	
			10:30	:15 (travel from Hicks Administration Building to School)	all		by taxi	
			11:00	01:00 Continued review of exhibits and records	all		School - team room	
			PM	12:00	01:30 Lunch (catered) and entry meeting with the Dean	all	Macy	School - team room
			01:30	01:00 Tour of the library	half the team	Fulford	Sexton Library	
			01:30	01:00 Meeting with Co-op Coordinator and exchange program coordinators	half the team	Costello, Burnay, Parcell	School - team room	
			02:30	01:00 Observation of studios	all	Sweetapple, Fitzgerald, Venart	School - studios	
			03:30	01:00 Continued review of exhibits and records	all		School - team room	
			04:30	01:00 School-wide entrance meeting with students	all	all students	School - auditorium	
			05:30	01:30 Reception with faculty, administrators, alumni, and local practitioners	all	faculty, alumni, NSAA	School - faculty lounge	
			07:00	02:00 Team-only dinner	all		restaurant TBA	
09:00	Debriefing session	all		School - team room or hotel				
Tuesday	March 10	AM	07:30	01:30 Team working breakfast with the Director	all	Burnay	Lord Nelson Hotel	
			09:00	01:00 Review of general studies, electives, and related programs	all		School - team room	
			10:00	01:00 Observation of lecture and seminar; continued review of exhibits and records	all	Macy, Cavanagh	School - auditorium, HA18	
			11:00	01:30 Continued review of exhibits and records	all		School - team room	
			PM	12:30	01:30 Team lunch (catered) with student representatives	all	DASA reps	School - HA18
			02:00	01:00 Meeting with staff	all	all staff members	School - team room	
			03:00	04:00 Complete review of exhibits and records	all		School - team room	
			07:00	01:30 Team-only dinner (catered)	all		School - team room	
			08:30	Accreditation deliberations and drafting the VTR	all		School - team room or hotel	
			Wednesday	March 11	AM	07:00	01:30 Team breakfast with the Director and Dean, where VTR results are presented	all
08:30	:15 Check out of the hotel	all					Lord Nelson Hotel	
09:00	:30 Exit meeting President, Provost, Dean of Graduate Studies, Assoc. VP Academic	all				Horzone, Watters, Leonard, Black	School - team room	
09:30	02:00 (unscheduled)							
11:30	:30 School-wide exit meeting with faculty, staff, and students	all				all faculty, staff, and students	School - auditorium	
PM	12:00	01:30 Team-only lunch				all		restaurant TBA
02:00	:40 Visiting Team members travel from School to airport	all					by taxi	
4:00-5:10	Visiting Team members depart from Halifax airport	all						

V. Report Signatures



Myriam Blais • Team Chair
representing the educators



Marc Boutin
representing the educators / practitioners



Brian Gregersen
representing the practitioners



Geneviève Vachon
representing the educators



Rachelle Lemieux
representing the interns



Odile Roy
Observer

