



Canadian Architectural Certification Board
Conseil canadien de certification en architecture
1 rue Nicholas Street, Suite 710
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 7B7
T.: 613-241-8399 F.: 613-241-7991
info@cacb.ca www.cacb-ccca.ca

CACB CCCA

2014 CACB CONFERENCE

POSITION PAPERS SUMMARY



Canadian Architectural Certification Board
Conseil canadien de certification en architecture
1 rue Nicholas Street, Suite 710
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 7B7
T.: 613-241-8399 F.: 613-241-7991
info@cacb.ca www.cacb-ccca.ca

CACB CCCA

2014 CACB CONFERENCE

POSITION PAPERS SUMMARY

THEME 1: CHANGING CONTEXT OF ARCHITECTURE PRACTICE AND EDUCATION



POSITION PAPER SUMMARY

THEME 1: CHANGING CONTEXT OF ARCHITECTURE PRACTICE AND EDUCATION

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT: The Steering Committee received many position papers expressing ideas relevant to the conference overall theme Educating Future Architects. The position papers were carefully analysed and used to develop questions to focus the discussion. This document aims to summarize the salient points raised by the position papers as they relate to each question.

CONTEXT TO THEME 1

Theme One explores the large overarching questions that place architectural education and practice in the context of a changing environment. In order to guide us in a process that is aimed to help envision a future state of architectural education, research and practice, we need to first understand the context of where we came from, what was architecture in the past? Questions posed dealt with issues of where are we going as a profession? What stayed the same and what has changed? What are the essential components of the total education of an architect?

THEME 1 QUESTIONS

- 1.1 How was architecture taught, acquired or learned in the past? What is similar and what is different today?
- 1.2 What forces or influences are changing the practice of architecture? Both from the concept of architecture as discipline or architecture as profession?
- 1.3 What forces or influences are changing the paradigm CACB accredited architectural education for schools?
- 1.4 What are the global expectations for the education of professional architects, especially in the context of rapidly changing circumstances?
- 1.5 How are changing funding models for both projects and academia similar? How are they different? How do they affect outcomes?
- 1.6 What are the core tenants of architecture that are common to educators, regulators and practitioners?

OVERVIEW OF THEME 1 POSITION PAPERS

Position papers that were received touched on these general questions and also raised some specific issues about the education of an architect from school to licensure. Some commonalities arose from the papers, some papers asked broad question and others provided specific thoughts and recommendations. These primary topics included;

What is the role of practitioner as seen by the public currently? Is it that of a specialized craftsperson? There have been many changes in the construction industry, the architectural market and professional practice. These questions may be broad but if we do not understand changing architectural practice, then a response to education and internship will be difficult. Other respondents asked vital questions about what is the relationship between an increasingly globalized profession, regulators and education? How should SPCs capture this phenomenon? How does the evolution of architectural practice (technological, social, political and environmental) affect architectural education? Is education a driver or mirror of change? If practice is shifting towards increased specialization,



should core SPCs be reduced to a bare minimum? Should an increased reciprocity of professionals between associations, and international organizations, be explored?

A respondent commented that the profession is seeing an increase of digital design and presentation tools and wonders about the capability of an architect to advance a project from conceptual design to a well-considered and technically successful construction document – can SPC's address this? Architects need the understanding of material culture and the craft of construction as part of a holistically integrated process. The profession and schools should emphasize importance and applied integration of comprehensive design. If practice is shifting towards increased specialization, should core SPCs be reduced to a bare minimum? Do we need to differentiate between Licensure and a Certificate of Practice (CoP)? Should we reduce licensure requirements or increase them and eliminate additional steps for the CoP?

The future of architectural practice will require a new attitude toward partnerships. How can these partnerships improve relationships between the profession and education? What formal education should (must?) schools teach; licensing bodies exam, and; firms provide through internship?

Much of the future of the profession depends upon research – new processes and new materials. Expanded research mandates of universities push educators beyond just providing an architectural education - how does this impact students? What is the value of research? Does practice and university define it similarly? Will it be an important skill for architects to learn? What implications does it have on the curriculum (SPCs)? Should accreditation evaluate the type, amount, quality or impact of research a program conducts; as well as the profile of the program in terms of research and service?

Many respondents included internship as a question of the changing face of the profession. They asked, how can the profession strengthen communication and partnerships, support interns and include them in activities of the regulators? They recommended strengthening mentorship relationships, streamlining and incentivizing internship processes and improving relevance of the IAP experience requirements. Can internship start while students are in school?

Asking broad questions about the schools, the papers suggested that schools could raise awareness and understanding of the profession, help place students in internships, strengthen professional practice courses and coordinate between students and practice. Another suggestion was to place more emphasis on leadership and encourage team-work across disciplines, including management and financial skills. One respondent suggested re-introducing the skills of hand-sketching and model-making to better understand spatial organization and architectural detailing, and emphasize craft of construction to express design intent at different scales.



Canadian Architectural Certification Board
Conseil canadien de certification en architecture
1 rue Nicholas Street, Suite 710
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 7B7
T.: 613-241-8399 F.: 613-241-7991
info@cacb.ca www.cacb-ccca.ca

CACB CCCA

2014 CACB CONFERENCE

POSITION PAPERS SUMMARY

THEME 2: SCHOOLS AND FIRMS AS EDUCATIONAL PARTNERS



POSITION PAPER SUMMARY

THEME 2 – SCHOOLS AND FIRMS AS EDUCATIONAL PARTNERS

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT: The Steering Committee received many position papers expressing ideas relevant to the conference overall theme Educating Future Architects. The position papers were carefully analysed and used to develop questions to focus the discussion. This document aims to summarize the salient points raised by the position papers as they relate to each question.

CONTEXT TO THEME 2: With change being inevitable, collaboration and partnership play an important role for architecture. We must be prepared to explore new modes of cooperation between schools and practices if we are to improve performance, quality, and maintain excellence in education and practice of architecture.

PREAMBLE FROM THE CONFERENCE STEERING COMMITTEE

One position paper [TIF] offered the following quote as its near-closing argument:

“Today, students and young professionals are fundamental drivers of change in the architectural profession. Critiques of the architectural discipline have periodically pointed to a disconnect between academia and professional practice. The perceived formal whimsy of academics and the stale pragmatism of practice sit at opposite ends of the spectrum.”

Curious of the origin and context of that quote, especially with regard to the present topic for discussion, the CACB 2014 Conference Committee found out that the next and last sentence of the paragraph it is taken from reads as follows:

“The panellists considered how recently, that divide is being bridged with a mutual acknowledgement of relevance between academic and professional realms.”

This seems a fitting point of departure for the present discussion: while mutually acknowledging the relevance of our specific realms, how would it be possible to be best partners in improving performance, quality, and excellence in education and practice in the production of architecture?

DISCUSSION QUESTION 2.1

WHAT ARE THE OPPORTUNITIES THAT SHOULD BE PROVIDED TO STUDENTS AND INTERNS IN ORDER TO ENHANCE THEIR LEARNING ENVIRONMENTS? WHAT IS THE POTENTIAL FOR IMPROVEMENT WITH RESPECT TO SAID ENVIRONMENTS?

Answers to the first part of this question came mostly from position papers submitted by students and/or interns. One [TIF] mentioned “empowerment” – that is the acknowledgement or the affirmation of the students’ and interns’ value for the profession and society – as an opportunity that should be given to all of them. Another [RÉA] stated that interns, as much as students, should also be offered a “learning environment of quality”.

For students and interns, therefore, potentials for improvement in their learning environment are:

- **Strengthening the curriculum relevance to practice [TIF], that is:**
 - *Add or improve content relative to issues such as building envelope science, professional practice, project management and business skills.*
 - *Continue and strengthen curriculum relating to entrepreneurship.*
 - *Teach students about other possible roles within the construction industry, e.g., contracting, project management, cost and energy management, etc.*



- *Continue to create learning opportunities that are collaborative in nature incorporating partnerships with students and educators from other related disciplines, e.g., engineering, landscape architecture, interior design, building science, etc.*
- *Consider the inclusion and facilitation of more co-op programs.*
- **Assess the quality of internship environments [RÉA]:**
 - *Similar to the CACB's quality assessment of schools of architecture, the tools and measures used to assess the quality of internship learning environments should be the subject of serious discussion during the Validation Conference so that they can be improved in the best interest of intern architects.*
 - *That said, the students -- who are eager for new learning experiences -- expect internship environments to provide the necessary support for the training they are charged with providing.*
- **The hard-to-get first internship [RÉA]:** *Based on what our colleagues tell us, the RÉA believes that it is increasingly difficult for school of architecture graduates to be accepted for a first internship. Even when graduates demonstrate creative, critical thinking and research skills, architectural firms seem to almost systematically prefer those who have extensive technical and specialized knowledge, especially when they completed a technical program before entering university. The RÉA would therefore like to encourage architectural firms to use a broader approach when selecting interns and further invites them to recognize the scope and importance of their responsibilities in preparing future architects.*

Other position papers suggested that:

- Schools should renew the focus on the craft of construction [Johnson]: ... in recent years there seems to have been a shift in architecture school faculty composition away from those who actually possess serious practice experience. The result is that often the faculty overseeing studio work have other agendas, or lack the experience necessary to provide the students with adequate direction regarding issues of construction.
- In order to make internship more meaningful [Palmquist], Incent architects to hire, retain and broadly mentor interns. This incentive could comprise anything from an honour roll to credits against firm licensing fees.
- Continuing education should be better suited for interns and young architects [Palmquist]: it became clear to me that the younger cohort was not being well served. Continuing Education as currently offered is focused on practitioners, to the exclusion of information desperately sought by interns and young architects.

DISCUSSION QUESTION 2.2

HOW CAN WE DEFINE THE RESPECTIVE ROLES OF SCHOOLS AND PRACTICES IN THE EDUCATION AND PREPARATION OF FUTURE ARCHITECTS?

Most authors mentioned the necessary learning continuum or complementarity that must characterize the path from academic education to internship (and to practice), and some made suggestions to help achieving it (see question 2.3). With regard to respective roles of:

- Schools:
 - Promote **a broader definition of the discipline and profession** [Cormier] that recognizes architects' intellectual status and explicitly develops their creative abilities.
 - Promote **broad-based** architectural education [RÉA] so as to deepen theoretical and technical [practical] concepts in a way that focuses on the acquisition of theoretical knowledge as well as the creative process that is central to the discipline and preparing students for architectural research.



- **University architectural research** [Cormier]: Research-based education practices in architectural schools have grown considerably in the last few decades. Such practices foster the intellectual, critical and cultural growth of future professionals and meet the need to ground professional education in the knowledge development inherent in the university context. Research contributes significantly to the emergence of professional projects and the resulting empowerment of future professionals, preparing them to respond socially, culturally, technically and technologically in ever-changing environments.
- **Practices:**
 - With regards to internship [RÉA] as an opportunity to develop knowledge and the practical aspects of the profession and their effective application.

DISCUSSION QUESTION 2.3

HOW COULD THE TEACHING OF THE NECESSARY SKILLS AND COMPETENCIES BE SHARED BETWEEN BOTH BODIES? CAN THE TRANSITION BETWEEN THE TWO BE IMPROVED?

While position papers did not comprehensively address the first part of this question (shared responsibilities in teaching specific skills, or who does what), some carefully addressed the second part on the improvement of the transition path from school to internship.

Referring to the 2001 Validation Conference (held in Val David, Quebec), one author [Covo] recalls that one of the outcomes of this meeting was that “the familiar image of the architect’s education ending with the professional degree and the career starting on the first day in the office should be abandoned”, and that the familiar metaphors of “threshold” or “bridge” (between school and practice) had to be replaced by a new “model that links education and practice in ways that dissolve the boundaries separating education, internship and practice”. Such a model may consist of developing strategies for the **integration of theory and practice** during school. This question of the **integration of work experience with academic study** [Costello], or the exposure to practice within the curriculum [Johns], or the **value of experiential learning and of meaningful exposure to professional practice while still in school** [Taylor], has been raised by many authors, and some suggestions offered.

In one author’s view [Covo], for instance:

- **Universities should enable long-term and even permanent relationships with effective teacher-practitioners:** *The importance of the role of the teacher-practitioner in the delivery of design studios and other courses in architecture programs cannot be overstated as a mechanism for preserving ongoing and continuous collaboration between the academy and the profession.*
- **Students should acquire work experience during school:** *Between the traditional curriculum, with one or two dedicated courses addressing professional practice, and the coop or work/study model, as developed in programs like those at Waterloo and Dalhousie, lie several interesting and effective models for integrating theory and practice, each with its limitations, advantages and disadvantages. Some of the more familiar include the pseudo coop, design-build, the storefront office, research-based collaboration, and the office studio.*

This prompted the author [Covo] to raise the following questions:

- *Should the Schools be harmonizing current requirements in some programs for periods of work experience with the requirements of the Internship in Architecture Program and the particular conditions of local regulators? Do the teacher-practitioners who already play key roles in every university program have a special role to play in relation to Internship?*



- *Does the recently renewed Syllabus Program provide a model for work/study that can, or should, be adapted by traditional programs? Should every student in our professional programs be registered with the IAP in their first year? In their second year?*
- *Among the many examples of curricular models that recognize and, in some cases, even award credit for work experience, which ones demonstrate desirable levels of critical engagement with practice? Which ones develop meaningful opportunities for the profession to similarly engage teaching and research activities in the schools?*

Another author [Taylor], in his paper's Position Five, encourages CALA to "reexamine practical experience, value experience outside of the professional office and seek **better ways to integrate formal education and experience**"

:

- CALA should look beyond the apprenticeship model of experience to consider experience in the areas of construction, building component manufacture, development and finance, urban and landscape design and many others, as valuable elements to count in an architect's practical experience.
- CALA should allow properly documented experience in a professional office or of the type noted above when done in conjunction with the professional degree program and before graduation.
- Schools should develop within their curricula vehicles both similar to, and different from, the familiar Co-op terms that allow focused, documented and evaluated experiences to be a part of the rhythm of the school program

Commenting on his Position Five, the author [Taylor] continues:

- There is no question of the value of experiential learning and of meaningful exposure to professional practice while still in school. In order to move forward it helps to understand where you are (not essential, but helpful). Understanding contemporary practice is important. To assume that employment in an architect's office is the only view of practice that counts is not useful. It perpetuates what architecture critic Reyner Banham referred to as "the cult of the longhouse". There is as much to be learned about the architect in contemporary society from the outside as the inside, and creative opportunities are available to do this. They should be recognized and count for a reasonable portion of the required practical experience

Another position paper [TIF], highlighting how "an architect's education starts on day one of university and continues until retirement", suggests that a "more formal process" be established between schools and the profession with regards to "preparation for the internship process". This process could, for instance:

- Provide instruction/information sessions within schools by the Provincial licensing authorities "to explain the nature of the profession and its commitments". This would constitute a very valuable demonstration of the continuum at work education and practice, and could help rub out the "disconnect" that students and interns may actually feel between them.
- *Involve the profession in pre-graduation programmes focused on preparing students for the internship phase.*
- Involve the schools in providing continuing education for architects and intern architects.
- Expand the presence of the Regulators in the Schools through increased workshops and seminars addressing professional practice and ethics as well as other less formal interactions such as small discussion sessions or facilitated opportunities for one on one conversations.

DISCUSSION QUESTION 2.4

WHAT MEANS/TOOLS/METRICS WILL ENCOURAGE PARTNERSHIPS BETWEEN SCHOOLS AND PRACTICES? HOW SHOULD THEY BE REVISITED OR RE-EVALUATED SO THAT THEY ARE FLEXIBLE ENOUGH TO ADAPT TO CHANGES AND EMERGENT ISSUES?



Means or processes for encouraging partnership between schools and practices have been presented in question 2.3, namely with regards to the “transition path” from education to internship. No tools or metrics that could measure the success or the flexibility of this transition have been presented: this part of the question still remains to be addressed ...

DISCUSSION QUESTION 2.5

HOW CAN SCHOOLS AND REGULATORS COOPERATE IN RESEARCH, CONTINUING EDUCATION, ETC. IN ORDER TO BE MUTUALLY BENEFICIAL AND FOSTER AN APPROPRIATE ARCHITECTURAL APPROACH FOR TODAY AND TOMORROW?

A few position papers mentioned the possibility and importance of cooperation between schools and practice through continuing education.

Some also stressed the need for the profession/discipline as a whole to **re/define its essential and fundamental roles and responsibilities** and to **articulate and highlight its value for our societies**, now and for the future; a challenge that would seemingly be best tackled in partnership.



Canadian Architectural Certification Board
Conseil canadien de certification en architecture
1 rue Nicholas Street, Suite 710
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 7B7
T.: 613-241-8399 F.: 613-241-7991
info@cacb.ca www.cacb-ccca.ca

CACB CCCA

2014 CACB CONFERENCE

POSITION PAPERS SUMMARY

THEME 3: ACCREDITATION



POSITION PAPER SUMMARY

THEME 3 – ACCREDITATION

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT: The Steering Committee received many position papers expressing ideas relevant to the conference overall theme Educating Future Architects. The position papers were carefully analysed and used to develop questions to focus the discussion. This document aims to summarize the salient points raised by the position papers as they relate to the discussion questions.

CONTEXT TO THEME 3:

One of the outcomes of this conference will be a series of recommendations, to the CACB by the organizing committee, on changes to the conditions of and procedures for accreditation. In light of our discussions yesterday, how would we go forward with a more robust process for accreditation that reflects the needs of the profession in the coming years?

DISCUSSION QUESTION 3.1

BROAD EDUCATION INCLUDING LIBERAL ARTS REMAINS IMPORTANT FOR THE EDUCATION OF A PROFESSIONAL; HOW CAN WE MAINTAIN THIS FOUNDATION WHILE EMPHASIZING SPECIALIZED KNOWLEDGE?

As one submission put the question:

The education of an architect is notoriously complex. This has been true since the days of Vitruvius, and remains true today – perhaps even more so as our worlds become more complex.

- *What are the essential components of the total education of an architect? Is it enough for an architect to be competent in areas affecting life safety and the techniques of building construction, or are there additional areas in which competency is necessary?*
- *How do we, or do we, differentiate between Architects and technologists?*

Although there was broad agreement on the necessity of a liberal arts basis for architectural education, several writers commented that technical and business-related education is not strong enough.

One writer framed the educational needs of people entering internship as follows:

1. *An understanding, through a broad education, of the society for which they will be operating. Without this, the would-be architect is limited to the role of technician;*
2. *An understanding of architecture as a discipline: of the culture and history of architecture, and of its theoretical foundations in the contemporary world;*
3. *Well-developed skills in the processes used to create designs for buildings and clear abilities to create appropriate and pleasing designs;*
4. *A deep and broad understanding of the technical necessities for the construction of buildings; an*
5. *A general understanding of the processes by which buildings are designed and constructed, and by which Architecture is organized as a business.*

Another writer proposed that all post-secondary courses in mathematics, science, humanities and written composition should be completed before admission to architecture school.



Another writer suggested that a minimum of 1/3 of credits in all pre-professional and professional architectural degree programs be comprised of technical, professional and/or business courses, based on an analysis of some of the better-regarded schools (from the point of view of the profession).

Another submission pointed out that, in a survey of recent graduates of accredited architecture programs in Canada:

- Only 32% of respondents indicated that their education was either effective or very effective at preparing them for entry into the profession. Respondents indicated that their education prepared them best in the area of schematic design, with the following areas leaving them the most unprepared:
 - Bidding & Contract Negotiation
 - Building Cost Analysis
 - Construction Phase - office and site
 - Project Management

And, from another survey, the top five skills sought by practices were:

- Construction documents 28%
- Design development 27%
- Schematic design at 26%,
- Code research at 17%.
- Specifications and material research at 13%

DISCUSSION QUESTION 3.2

THE ACCREDITATION PROCESS, INSTITUTED IN CANADA IN 1991, HAS SEEN AN EVOLUTIONARY CHANGE IN ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION IN CANADA. IS THE OVERALL MODEL STILL SOUND AND OF VALUE?

One paper suggested that we should consider whether accreditation itself still makes sense, or whether we would be better off in Canada looking for some other method of evaluating the education of applicants to the profession. The arguments are similar to those of other authors: it is expensive, ineffective and inflexible as a process, it does not enrich education but constrain it, and it is an outdated model. Another author suggested that all architectural education in Canada should be removed from the Universities and placed under the direct control of the CACB. Other radical submissions proposed significant changes to the accreditation structure and process aimed at addressing the issues noted above, but without throwing out the system completely.

DISCUSSION QUESTION 3.3

GRADUATES EDUCATED OUTSIDE OF THE CACB AND NAAB ACCREDITATION PROCESS CONTINUE TO BE EVALUATED ACCORDING TO THE CANADIAN EDUCATIONAL STANDARD (CES). SHOULD THIS PROCESS BE RECONSIDERED IN LIGHT OF ACCREDITATION?

Although there were no specific papers addressing this issue, it remains a core issue that should be discussed at this conference. At the moment we have two distinct processes and standards for evaluating the education of applicants to internship in Canada, depending on where they were educated. This does not seem likely to become less significant as an issue in the future, giving increasing global mobility among professionals.

DISCUSSION QUESTION 3.4

THE CURRENT CONDITIONS FOR ACCREDITATION REFLECT A NUMBER OF INPUT PARAMETERS (SUCH AS INSTITUTIONAL STRUCTURE, BUDGETS, SPACE NEEDS, STAFFING, ETC.) THAT REFLECT TYPICAL STRUCTURE OF



ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION AT THE TIME THE CONDITIONS WERE WRITTEN. GIVEN THE BROADER MANDATE OF THE CONFERENCE TO EXAMINE THE EVOLVING NEEDS OF AND PRESSURES ON ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION, WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED TO THE CONDITIONS?

One author pointed out that there is a lack of clarity around the conditions at present. For example, are there any conditions that MUST be met? How many “Not Met” conditions are possible before overall accreditation is threatened? What happens in the current process if conditions are not met? The implied proposal here is that the questions around Not Met conditions need to be clarified and made more objective. One author suggested that in addition to drastically reducing the number of conditions, ALL remaining conditions must be met in order for accreditation to continue.

One author has recommended that a requirement be placed, presumably in the condition around HR, for architectural licensure for faculty teaching at least particular courses in accredited programs. This requirement is currently in place for Engineering accreditation in Canada. As one paper puts it:

In the 1950s and 1960s, many faculty members in schools of architecture were architects. This was at least partly because at that time it was easy to gain licensure once one had a professional degree. Beginning in the mid-1970s, the requirements for licensure became more and more prescriptive and onerous, for legitimate reasons. Enrollment in an intern program was a requirement of the process, and specific amounts of detailed areas of experience and examinations were required. In the last decade the development of the ExAC exam and modifications to the intern program have modified these conditions somewhat, but the program is still rigorous and detailed.

When an individual is hired into the faculty of a school of architecture, and begins to teach full time, there is very limited time available for that individual to work under the supervision of an architect and engage in the intern program. As a consequence, registered architects are a distinct minority among full time faculty members. This is true all across North America.

A number of authors discussed various modes of experiential learning – Co-Op programs, design/build studios, and so on. By implication, the CACB might consider adding a Condition which would require each program to address this issue.

DISCUSSION QUESTION 3.5

SIMILARLY, THE STUDENT PERFORMANCE CRITERIA (SPC) IDENTIFY EXPECTED LEVELS OF ABILITY AND KNOWLEDGE ON THE PART OF GRADUATES READY TO ENTER INTERNSHIP. WHAT CHANGES SHOULD BE CONSIDERED MAKING THESE CRITERIA (SIMPLIFICATION, CONDENSING, CLARIFICATIONS, ADDITIONS) TO REFLECT EVOLVING EXPECTATIONS OF INTERNS AND CHANGES IN THE PROFESSION?

A number of authors suggested changes to the SPCs. One radical suggestion was to reduce the number of SPCs to five or six broad areas, rather than a large number of small competencies. Other authors noted the increasing role of specialization in the industry, and the difficulty of achieving specialization within the SPC format. Another suggested that in general less prescriptive and more flexible SPCs would be more effective. More evolutionary changes proposed included:

- Add SPCs requiring graduates to have the ability to engage with emerging technologies.
- Add an SPC requiring an understanding of the global nature of practice.
- Add an SPC to require abilities with traditional tools of the architect such as hand sketching and model-making.
- An engagement with changing construction processes and project delivery methods should be mandated through the SPCs.



- The SPCs around Professional Internship should be clarified and reconceptualised. Perhaps these could be re-thought around the idea of Co-Op, design/build, etc.
- Comprehensive Design should be elevated to a mandatory requirement that MUST be met in order for the SPC condition as a whole to be met. This was echoed by another author, who wrote:

The first suggestion would be one of emphasis. I would suggest that the category C of Student Performance Criteria, i.e. Comprehensive Design, be given a greater weight within the architectural curriculum – not viewed as something which needs addressing in the final year of school, but which is fully integrated into design work from the first year. It is within this category that many of the elements of category B are actually applied to architectural design projects, and I have observed this to be the biggest challenge for students. Studying concepts in the abstract is one thing – applying them to real situations is difficult, and requires practice.

It was also suggested that the CACB recognize that some SPCs are more important than others.

DISCUSSION QUESTION 3.6

AS A RESULT OF DISCUSSIONS AT THE CONFERENCE, RECOMMENDATIONS WILL BE MADE TO THE CACB REGARDING THE PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE PROCEDURES FOR ACHIEVING AND MAINTAINING ACCREDITATION. HOW MIGHT THE CACB REVISE THE PROCEDURES TO IMPROVE THE EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF THE PROCESS AND CONSISTENCY OF ITS OUTCOMES?

Two authors suggested making more use of quality review procedures already in place at the various Universities in order to reduce the extent of the site visit and the reporting requirements, and to make greater use of annual reports. These authors suggested that accreditation should be reconceptualized to be an ongoing process, without definite term, rather than a major event that happens every six (or so) years.

One of the two phrased the resulting process as follows:

[The CACB] should reorganize the accrediting cycle and the site visit structure, considering the following:

- The portion of the current Visit agenda that can be dealt with off-site by an expanded regular documentation and review by the Board or its agents
- The portion that still requires on-site review and verification
- The Team size and makeup should be appropriate to the new Site Visit task.
- The Visit content and schedule, and accreditation term should be appropriate to the revised review process.
- In response to the possible outcome of these previous considerations, the Board should consider a voluntary alternative model to the current all-in APR/Site Visit occurring every 6 or 8 years. It would rely on expanded periodic documenting, reporting, review and feedback as well as site visits appropriate in scale and schedule. This model would allow the Board to respond more appropriately with advice or direction and schedule more modest school visits that are individually timed and more positive and constructive since they are not directly connected to an accreditation decision. The model would be implemented at the request of a school following its next regular Site Visit under the existing Conditions and Procedures.
- **Accreditation under this model would be “Without Definite Term”.**

Other authors suggested extending the current term from six to eight years and eliminating the focused evaluations.



Canadian Architectural Certification Board
Conseil canadien de certification en architecture
1 rue Nicholas Street, Suite 710
Ottawa, Ontario K1N 7B7
T.: 613-241-8399 F.: 613-241-7991
info@cacb.ca www.cacb-ccca.ca

CACB CCCA

2014 CACB CONFERENCE

POSITION PAPERS SUMMARY

THEME 4: INTERNSHIP



POSITION PAPER SUMMARY

THEME 4 – INTERNSHIP

PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT: The Steering Committee received many position papers expressing ideas relevant to the conference overall theme Educating Future Architects. The position papers were carefully analysed and used to develop questions to focus the discussion. This document aims to summarize the salient points raised by the position papers as they relate to each question.

CONTEXT TO THEME 4:

The internship program has been considered a key part of the development of a registered architect. It represents the link between education and licensure. As such, educators, regulators and practitioners all have a role to fulfill in order to make it a successful and consistent program for all partners. The intern is central to this mandate

DISCUSSION QUESTION 4.1

HOW CAN INTERNSHIP BECOME A BETTER EXPERIENCE FOR BOTH PRACTITIONERS AND INTERNS AND WHAT INCENTIVES COULD BE INTRODUCED?

Many of the papers submitted questioned how the internship process could be developed into a better experience for the interns and how they could relate the educational process with the practical process of the architectural office. How can we develop a deeper richer experience for interns?

A number of papers questioned the idea that an integrated internship program that included learning with practical experience would provide the intern with a better learning experience as well as prepare them for practice.

How do practitioners benefit from employing interns, as one paper suggested that the employer was laying the foundation of future partners in the office? One paper went further and suggested that experience gained outside the office should count such as construction experience, development and finance.

DISCUSSION QUESTION 4.2

WHO WOULD BETTER ADMINISTER THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM TO ENSURE A CONSISTENT LEVEL OF EXPERIENCE – EITHER THE REGULATORS/CACB/SCHOOLS?

There has to be a better way to integrate the education of architects between the schools and profession, should a program be developed which would include supervised work terms at specific stages during the education process.

One paper notes that as education of architects is a partnership between the Universities and the profession, this validation conference seems an appropriate venue to revisit the important role of internship in the process of becoming a registered architect. If internship is to remain a vital bridge between school and professional practice it seems necessary for all to address this critical topic.

A number of papers suggested that the program needs to be co-ordinated and suggested that the schools are better prepared to administer an integrated program, much like the current co-op programs with a stronger role played by the school.

One paper suggested that schools needed to develop within their curricula vehicles both similar to, and different from the familiar co-op terms that allow focused, documented and evaluated experiences to be part of the school program.

One paper suggested that interns emerge from a structured program with formal avenues for input and a strong peer group into an environment where they have to consider balancing specified experience requirements with the need to support them as well as repay a debt.

DISCUSSION QUESTION 4.3

CAN WE PROVIDE A MORE COMPREHENSIVE SUPPORT SYSTEM FOR MENTORS AND SUPERVISING ARCHITECTS TO ENSURE THAT THEY FULFIL THEIR ROLE?

How can the regulatory regime provide a better experience to interns and support during the intern years and should they interview offices prior to allowing them to become offices where interns can work? Do all interns have to get their experience in traditional architectural offices or should we allow them the option to gain experience in non-traditional offices?

It is suggested that interns do not have their own association and receive little support from the ones they are attempting to gain admittance.

It is suggested, in one paper that the profession should work with interns to improve the experience by

- providing information sessions on benefits and responsibilities of licensure; explaining all steps of the internship process
- providing easy and up to date access to information
- streamlining and unifying the IAP processes across country
- appointing a member of the association council to liaise with intern members
- facilitating peer support networks, particularly for newcomers and for those in small practices or communities
- encouraging in-house intern committees in larger work places
- providing study material and exam preparation workshops
- facilitating mentor matching
- allowing Interns to have a voice in Association matters
- providing timely and frequent feedback
- acknowledging progress and encouraging success

DISCUSSION QUESTION 4.4

HOW MUCH STRUCTURE AND REGULATION SHOULD BE INTRODUCED INTO THE PROGRAM AND AT WHAT LEVEL?

Should practices that accept interns be visited by CACB (or whoever administers the program) periodically and can guidelines be developed to ensure that practices understand their role and responsibility? Is the role of the mentor clearly understood and what responsibility do they have to ensure that interns are receiving the correct set of skills?

DISCUSSION QUESTION 4.5



HOW MUCH SHOULD THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM COMPLEMENT THE SCHOOLS TO ENSURE THAT THE MINIMUM COMPETENCY STANDARD FOR ARCHITECTS IS ACHIEVED?

What are the respective roles of the schools and practices with regard to architectural education and can we develop clear roles and responsibilities? Schools, it is maintained, should teach theory and design of architecture while internship focuses on the technology and practice of architecture – can these themes be integrated?

Can interns learn through accredited courses? Would there be a national data base controlled by CACB and who would provide or approve the courses and what part of the internship program could they replace?

DISCUSSION QUESTION 4.6

HOW OFTEN SHOULD THE INTERNSHIP PROGRAM BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED TO REFLECT CURRENT TRENDS AND PRACTISES?

How does internship deal with the ever increasing drive towards specialisation?

As professional practice has changed, should not internship guidelines change or be revisited?

How would the internship program be updated to keep current with trends in the practice of architecture and should specialisation be allowed in certain aspects of the program?