CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL CERTIFICATION BOARD

CONSEIL CANADIEN DE CERTIFICATION EN ARCHITECTURE

2024 Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture Program. M. Arch.

Institution: Laurentian 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: The CACB Accreditation 3

II. Summary of Team Findings 6

1. Team's General Comments 6
2. Conditions for Accreditation "met" and "not met": a summary 7
3. Program's Progress since the previous site visit (from previous VTR) 9
4. Program Strengths 16
5. Causes of Concern and Team's recommendations 16

III. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation 17

IV. Appendices 32

Appendix A: Program Information 32
Appendix B: The Visiting Team (names & contact information) 36
Appendix C: The Visit Agenda 37

V. Report Signatures 39

I. Introduction: The CACB Accreditation

The CACB is a national independent non-profit corporation. The directors are elected from individuals nominated by the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities (CALA), the Canadian Council of University Schools of Architecture (CCUSA), and the Canadian Architecture Students Association (CASA). The CACB is 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 that are offered by Canadian universities (*Accreditation* Program).

The CACB's head office is in Ottawa, Ontario. It adheres to the principles of fairness, transparency, clarity, and ethical business practices in all of its activities.

By agreement of the licensing authorities (the 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 intended to apply for registration. 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. L'Ordre des Architectes du Québec joined the CACB in 1991 and the Northwest Territories Association of Architects joined in 2001.

Graduation from a CACB-accredited program is the first of three steps (education, experience, and examination) on the path to licensure.

The CACB only accredits *Programs* that are intended by their institution to be professional degrees in architecture that lead to licensure. Professional accreditation of a *Program* means that it has been evaluated by the CACB and substantially meets the educational standards that comprise, as a whole, an appropriate education for an architect.

The CACB only awards accreditation to professional degree *Programs* in architecture. A CACB-accredited professional *Program* in architecture is defined as the totality of a student's post-secondary education culminating in a designated professional university degree, which may be a bachelor of architecture (B.Arch) or a master of architecture (M.Arch) degree.

The *Program*s include:

- a minimum of five years of post-secondary study culminating in a master of architecture degree, which follows a *pre-professional* bachelor's degree, except in Quebec, where the minimum is four years of professional studies following two years of CEGEP;
- a minimum of six years of post-secondary study culminating in a master of architecture degree, which follows a bachelor's degree in any discipline and includes a minimum of three years of professional studies in architecture; or
- a minimum of five years of post-secondary study culminating in a bachelor of architecture degree.

In keeping with the principal of outcome-based *Accreditation*, the CACB does not restrict the structure of a professional *Program* and/or the distribution of its coursework.

The accreditation process requires a self-assessment by the institution or *Program*, an evaluation of the self-assessment by the CACB, and a site visit and review conducted by a team representing the CACB.
The process 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.

Terms of Accreditation

Term for Initial Accreditation
*Program*s seeking initial *accreditation* must first be granted candidacy status. The maximum period of candidacy status is six years.

*Program*s that achieve initial *accreditation* at any time during the six-year candidacy will receive an initial three-year term, indicating that all major program components and resources are in place. Some additional program development may be necessary and/or deficiencies may need to be corrected. Additionally, to be eligible for CACB certification, students cannot have graduated from the *Program* more than two years prior to the initial *accreditation*.

Terms for Continuing Accreditation

a) Six-year term: Indicates that deficiencies, if any, are minor and that a process to correct these deficiencies is clearly defined and in place. The *Program* is accredited for the full six-year period.

b) Six-year term with a "focused evaluation" at the end of three years: Indicates that significant deficiencies exist in meeting the requirements of the CACB Conditions and Terms for Accreditation; consideration of these deficiencies will form the basis of a focused evaluation. The *Program* is required to report on its particular deficiencies during the third year.

c) Three-year term: Indicates that major deficiencies are affecting the quality of the *Program*, but the intent to correct these deficiencies is clear and attainable. The *Program* is accredited for a full three-year period. If the *Program* receives two consecutive three-year terms of *accreditation*, then the *Program* must achieve a six-year *accreditation* term at the next *accreditation* visit. If the *Program* fails, it will be placed on a two-year probationary term. If the *Program* fails to achieve a six-year term at its subsequent *accreditation* visit, then its *accreditation* shall be revoked.

d) Two-year probationary term: Indicates that CACB deficiencies are severe enough to seriously question the quality of the *Program* and the intent or capability to correct these deficiencies is not evident. A *Program* on probation must show just cause for the continuation of its *accreditation*, and at its next scheduled review, the *Program* must receive at least a three-year term or *accreditation* will

be revoked. If the two-year probationary term is following the sequence described in "c," the *Program* must receive at least a six-year term or its *accreditation* shall be revoked.

e) Revocation of accreditation: Indicates that insufficient progress was made during a two-year probationary term to warrant a full three-year or six-year *accreditation* term. Notwithstanding, the foregoing *accreditation* of any *Program* can be revoked at any time if there is evidence of substantial and persistent non-compliance with the requirements of the CACB Terms and Conditions for Accreditation.

Term for Reinstated Accreditation

Should the accreditation of a *Program* lapse or be revoked, the procedures for reinstatement shall be the same as those applicable to initial candidacy. The term of reinstated *accreditation* is the same as the term of initial *accreditation*. If the *Program* is successful in achieving *accreditation* at any time during the six-year candidacy, the *Program* will receive a three-year term of *accreditation*.

II. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team's General Comments

The Visiting Team (VT) reviewed the Master of Architecture (M. Arch) and pre-professional Bachelor of Architectural Studies (BAS) of the McEwen School of Architecture (MSoA) at Laurentian University (LU), from February 29th to March 5th 2024.

The visit was conducted according to the 2017 CACB Conditions and Terms for Accreditation and the 2017 CACB Procedures for Accreditation, using the hybrid visit model with virtual student exhibition and entrance meetings, followed by onsite meetings with faculty, staff, and students.

The VT thanks Tammy Gaber, Director of the MSoA, and her dedicated support and teaching team, particularly Victoria Dominico, as well as the student body for the warm welcome.

All meetings took place as planned, with generous and open exchanges helpfully complementing the candid and detailed report prepared by the School.

The VT commends the School for including in the exhibition examples of very low pass student work, giving a clear picture of the range of work achieved by students. In addition to the report, during the visit the VT requested information about peer evaluations of group assignments, student support services, selection and scheduling of electives, co-op requirements, and budgeting.

The VT recognizes that some of the concerns identified are impacted by the lingering effects of COVID restrictions and severe financial challenges at LU, which had also impacted the 2021 initial accreditation visit...

2. Conditions for Accreditation "met" and "not met": a summary

	Met	Not Met
1. Program Self-Assessment	☑	☐
2. Public Information	☑	☐
3. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion	☑	☐
4. Student Composition, Well-Being, and Enrichment	☑	☐
5. Faculty and Staff Resources	☐	☑
6. Space and Technology Resources	☑	☐
7. Information Resources	☑	☐
8. Financial Resources	☐	☑
9. Administrative Structure	☑	☐
10. Professional Degrees and Curriculum	☑	☐
11.1. Program Performance Criteria (PPC)		
1. Professional development	☑	☐
2. Design education	☑	☐
3. Global perspectives and environmental stewardship	☑	☐
4. Collaboration, leadership, and community engagement	☑	☐
5. Technical knowledge	☑	☐
6 Breadth of education	☐	☑
11.2. Student Performance Criteria		
A. Design		
A1. Design Theories, Precedents, and Methods	☑	☐
A2. Design Skills	☑	☐
A3. Design Tools	☑	☐
A4. Program Analysis	☑	☐
A5. Site Context and Design	☑	☐
A6. Urban Design	☑	☐
A7. Detail Design	☑	☐
A8. Design Documentation	☑	☐
B. Culture, Communications, and Critical Thinking		
B1. Critical Thinking and Communication	☑	☐
B2. Architectural History	☑	☐
B3. Architectural Theory	☑	☐
B4. Cultural Diversity and Global Perspectives	☑	☐
B5. Ecological Systems	☑	☐
C. Technical Knowledge		
C1. Regulatory Systems	☑	☐
C2. Materials	☑	☐
C3. Structural Systems	☑	☐
C4. Envelope Systems	☑	☐
C5. Environmental Systems	☑	☐

D. Comprehensive Design		
D1. Comprehensive Design	☑	☐
E: Profession al Practice		
E1. The Architectural Profession	☑	☐
E2. Ethical and Legal Responsibilities	☑	☐
E3. Modes of Practice	☑	☐
E4. Professional Contracts	☑	☐
E5. Project Management	☑	☐

3. Program's Progress since the previous site visit (from previous VTR)

The Program provided the following information about their progress since the last visit:

Action:
MSoA full-time faculty met in August 2021 for a three-day faculty retreat to review, debrief and respond to the VTR concerns in addition to reflecting on eight years of teaching since MSoA was founded in 2013. Within a series of subsequent MSoA faculty meetings we unanimously voted on and designed curriculum and program modifications for the Master of Architecture Program (MArch) and the Bachelor of Architectural Studies Program (BAS). These course and program changes were vetted by SEA Curriculum Committee, SEA Faculty Council (and Grad council for the MArch) and finally by CELP. Approvals for the new BAS and MArch programs, as well as approvals for the modified and new courses were issued from CELP on January 13, 2022 for the BAS and February 17, 2022 for the MArch. Our course delivery and workload plan has now taken into account phasing in 2.0 versions of the programs this fall, 2022, as we phase out the 1.0 versions (of both programs).

Some concerns noted in the VTR:
Under "Section 2 Conditions for Accreditation 'met' and 'not met'" (page 7), of the 11 Conditions, nine were met (1. Program self-assessment; 2. Public information 3. Equity-Diversity; and Inclusion 4. Student Composition, well-being and enrichment 6. Space and technology resources 7. Information resources 8. Financial resources 9.Administrative structure 10. Professional degrees and curriculum), one was not met and one included detailed concerns.

#5 Faculty and Staff Resources was not met, (page 14):
"As Laurentian University will emerge from the dire financial situation that prevailed at the time of the virtual visit, new conditions or agreements will most likely have to take place with its academic units. In order to make sure that MSoA develops a rich academic curriculum and a sustainable growth, the Team encourages collegial and open discussion (see Cause of concern #1).
Depending on the targets that will be set for the future (for instance, the number of yearly admissions in each program), LU and MSoA will have to demonstrate that human resources will be adequate. As of now, the faculty complement appears sufficient in number to deliver the actual teaching load required by the programs.
If the MSoA decides to invest more forcefully in developing research and scholarship, as the Team recommends (see Cause of concern #2), the faculty complement may need to be augmented. However, and most importantly, the number of administrative staff is already insufficient to adequately support the School's pedagogical and financial activities or requirements (be it for the students, faculty, or the director), and is in urgent need for an IT support analyst. Moreover, additional staffing for shops, labs, library, and co-op coordinator will have to be assessed anew, post insolvency."

This continues to be a cause of concern for the School, especially given that a Technical Report (focussed exclusively on faculty, staff and student numbers) is due every June to the CACB. The MSoA has communicated to the Dean of SEA since the fall of 2021 the dire need for an onsite IT technician, full-time digital fabrication and workshop technicians, full-time Librarian and full-time faculty appointments especially replacing the positions of three faculty who left after CCAA started and one who retired in spring 2023. The remaining full-time faculty have extended beyond maximum to compensate for the lack of staff support in the school and this scenario is not at all sustainable. Since the fall of 2022, the SEA Dean has arranged for an IT technician to be at M.So.A a half day each week, demand is much greater and we hope for more of a presence in the coming years.

In the fall of 2022 one Fabrication technologist left, and another full-time technologist was hired. From the fall of 2021 - winter 2022 one workshop technician was on leave and the University paid for a temporary Digital Fabrication technologist and part time shop technician. Since the spring of 2023, the MSoA pays out of its operational budget the part-time hours for a Digital fabrication technologist, in the hope that there is more support for this position in the future.

The MSoA has also drafted plans to utilize some of the McEwen endowment to pay for part-time individuals to manage the community engagement/outreach and communications for the MSoA. The MSoA still does not have a full-time Librarian (see cause of concern below), and is hopeful that the University will support more Librarian presence in the MSoA library. As of August 1, 2023 MSoA successfully appointed a full-time tenure-track Assistant Professor in Indigenous Design and a Limited Term Appointment (1 year) for an Assistant Professor (FL) in Architectural design and communications. It is our hope that the University will honor its commitment to create a full-time position next year in place of the LTA and that more full-time positions will be created for the School. Currently, at 15 full-time professors for over 300 students, we are understaffed. This is exasperated by cyclical rotation of faculty taking sabbatical leave and other leaves. Thus, there are often only one or two full-time faculty per undergraduate design studio (who are paired with sessional instructors who they end up mentoring). It is good to note that all graduate studios are taught by full-time professors. The other exasperated issue with the low number of FT faculty is M. Arch thesis supervision. Our increased numbers of enrolled students have resulted in FT faculty supervising 4 to 5 students on top of their regular teaching load.
Continued support from LU is needed for MSoA to continue to function properly and deliver accredited professional education in architecture.

#11 Performance Criteria is further broken down in terms of Program performance criteria (PPC) , and Student Performance criteria (SPC). : Specific “Causes of Concern” noted in the VTR: (page 10-11) are as follows:

“Cause of concern #1: Sustainable development and growth of the Program The Program’s ability to maintain its uniqueness within the budgetary constraints that are likely forthcoming at Laurentian University is a crucial issue. The Team trusts that both LU and the MSoA will be most creative in successfully addressing this challenge collegially, through negotiation, and in the respect of the MSoA’s curricular autonomy. The team recommends that:

1. the identity of the MArch program be refined and enforced as to be most attractive to a variety of applicants (with various academic backgrounds, both locally and internationally),
2. Expectations and objectives about the number of incoming students that MSoA can reasonably and sustainably admit in each program be clarified between MSoA and LU, as well as the admission criteria to the MArch program,
3. The programs’ curriculum be reviewed in order to present a greater legibility and clearer focus (namely in the objectives, sequence, and content of courses),
4. The school, in its downtown location, is sufficiently staffed to maintain administrative assistance to students and faculty, design-build activities and digital labs, as well as growth of the library.”

In response to this concern:

1. the identity of the M.Arch program was refined in the updated version of the program, so that emphasis is placed on streamlining the courses that support Design Studio in the first year of the BAS program, and Design Research Thesis in the second year of the M.Arch program.

2. Faculty have worked hard to review and make offers to the M.Arch and BAS programs ahead of typical schedule, and are dedicated to ensuring continued large enrollment and quality education. However, as mentioned before, the current number of full-time faculty and staff atMSoA is not sufficient in supporting the 'expectations and objections about the number of incoming students that MSoA can reasonably and sustainably admit into each program'. The MSoA is in dire need of more full-time faculty to ensure consistent delivery of courses, research output from the school, mentorship and support of graduate students as well as the management of committees needed to support MSoA.
3. The curriculum of the BAS and MArch were reviewed and courses were selectively moved or revised (course name and calendar description), while some additional courses were created, which should provide greater legibility and clearer focus for the program. This was determined by the MSoA School Council (all revisions have been discussed and agreed upon by MSoA faculty members, based on the debriefing of the VTR and self-assessment of our program); see further elaboration below.
4. Located downtown, in a campus separate from the Laurentian University main campus, MSoA is in dire need of more full-time staff at the school; namely IT technologist, Digital Fabrication, a dedicated Co-op coordinator as well as a dedicated Librarian. As well, MSoA is in need of a building manager to follow up with the constant maintenance and security issues. The daily tasks of responding to IT, security, custodial and maintenance problems falls, unfairly, on the shoulders of the Director and administrative staff who are working far beyond their capacities and job descriptions.

"Cause of concern #2: Equilibrium of faculty's teaching and research activities Faculty appear to be devoting a lot of their weekly time on and around teaching activities. The Team recommends that the Program allows more opportunities and support to professors in establishing a strong research culture, in developing further the MSoA's initiated research and scholarship, and in sharing such scholarship in the academic curriculum."

In response to this concern:
This continues to be an issue at MSoA, with the remaining faculty picking up the load of teaching – as School of Architecture students utilize the building outside of class hours and look to professors for guidance and support; thus, full time faculty bear the brunt to support students beyond their specific studio sections. Additionally, thesis students are supervised by full-time architecture faculty only, thus with the reduced number of full-time faculty, each faculty member then needs to take on more thesis students (with the reduced compensation from $1000 to $333 as per the new LU Collective Agreement) resulting in an increased burden, and making it very difficult to dedicate time for pursuing research, applying for grants, publishing and establishing 'a strong research culture'. Despite these very difficult constraints, since 2020 several faculty have been successful in securing federally funded grants see section 3.8.2 for Research Funding.
Curriculum-wise, in the recalibrated BAS program, two new elective courses: Topics in Architecture (ARCH 3907) and Advanced Topics in Architecture (ARCH 4906) were created in order to allow faculty members to teach specialized topics in architecture in upper years of the BAS, within their field of expertise, that align with their research projects. These elective courses are to be taught by varying faculty members from year to year, depending on faculty research projects. These courses will thus not be mandatory to graduate from the BAS, but will be offered as "electives" to BAS students in 3rd and/or 4th year, due to their advanced nature.

Cause of concern #3: Student personal development The Program consists of almost exclusively mandatory courses, a situation that may be limiting to a broader exposure of international developments in architecture, as well as in the choices that students can make.
The team recommends that:

1. the Program develop various opportunities for students to advance their interests and be proactive in doing so, for instance by creating elective courses in architecture (and related fields),
2. The number of public exhibits (coming from outside MSoA) be augmented."

In response to this:

1. please see previous response regarding the creation of electives Topics in Architecture (ARCH 3907) and Advanced Topics in Architecture (ARCH 4906).
2. As well, MSoA has made a concerted effort with support funding from the Ontario Association of Architects (OAA) and the Royal Architectural Institute of Canada (RAIC) to host lectures by prominent scholars and architects. In addition to this, MSoA has printed at large scale the award winning MArch thesis design proposals of the graduating cohorts and displayed these throughout the school. Since the fall of 2022, MSoA has returned to hosting in-person public lectures and exhibitions.

1. The first year Design Studio (ARCH 1515) completed construction of ice stations with wood donated from EACOM, financial support from TD Bank and community support from the City of Greater Sudbury and local businesses in 2022 and 2023. Both times these ice stations were exhibited and used on the skating path for a month by the public. Other design-build projects in the school are rooted in community collaborations and use, such as the third year studio collaboration with Downtown Business Improvement Area (BIA) Association of Sudbury to construct temporary urban furniture and the collaboration of graduate studios and optional courses with Sagamok First Nations to construct a pedestrian bridge. These projects are important pedagogically and as an interface with the community. Please see this recent news article regarding on-going community work: https://www.universityaffairs.ca/news/news-article/building-bridges/
   MSoA faculty have maintained the social media pages for the school on Instagram and Facebook as well as the dedicated website (that had been paid for from McEwen funds) https://mcewenarchitecture.ca/ which publicly exhibits new student work, lectures, awards, announcements as well as studio and thesis reviews. This website is still relatively new and is our best marketing tool, MSoA is actively developing and expanding our web presence through this dedicated website. https://mcewenarchitecture.ca/
2. During 2020-2022 MSoA has far fewer physical exhibits due to the COVID pandemic and the university legislated limitation of access to the building in person. However, MSoA has actively hosted several important exhibitions for the benefit of the students, public local community and professionals, including:
   - Sept. 2021: Student Work exhibition, Sept 7-10
   - Sept. 2022: Student Work exhibition, Sept. 6-9
   - March 2022: Bruce Mau exhibition - MSoA Library display of his publications in support of the Northern Ontario premiere of MAU (Design the Time of Your Life) film.
   - March. 2023: Nuit Blanche 2023 (student-led event and exhibition)
   - June 2023: Design with Dignity competition, OAA 2023 Conference
   - June 2023: Renowned local architect, Art Towenend was celebrated with a dedicated exhibit of photographs of his buildings in sudbury, commissioned by the Northern Ontario

Society of Architects as part of the Ontario Association of Architects 2023 conference. This exhibit was mounted in the main space at MSoA and was publicly accessible.

- June 2023: MArch studios and award-winning Thesis Exhibition, OAA 2023 Conference
- Sept. 2023: Student Work exhibition, Sept. 6-10

Cause of concern #4. The Team appreciates the richness and unique qualities of the Program, as well as its contribution to the discipline of architecture. However, according to the CACB requirements for assessing SPC through student work, the Team noticed that the following need more attention:

1. design theories (SPC A1) have to be more clearly explicated and organized throughout the curriculum,
2. The strong accent on wood structures (SPCs A7 and C3) has to be judiciously complemented with steel and concrete construction,
3. The history-theory streams (SPCs B2 and B3) have to be clarified to ensure that courses' content and assignments are logically building up during the course of the curriculum,
4. Comprehensive design (SPC D1) should include a significant proportion of individual assignments."

In response to this:

1. The course Design Thinking (ARCH 1006) was revised in order to address this issue, this course will address more directly and specifically SPC A1.
2. The course Structures and Material Behaviour (new name) (ARCH 3316) was revised in order to address this issue; this course will address more directly and specifically the topics of steel and concrete construction, complementing the MSoA strong accent on wood structures – addressed in moving Wood Structures from third to first year (from ARCH 2316 to ARCH 1306) and Structures and Material Behaviour (ARCH 3316) was updated.
3. In response to this, and to best prepare students in alignment with MSoA tri-cultural mandate, the following modifications were made: Indigenous Precedents was moved from 3rd to 1st year (was ARCH 3006 now ARCH 1017); Cultural Sustainability was moved from 4th to 3rd year (was ARCH 4016 now ARCH 3026); Writings in Architecture and Urbanism was moved from 3rd to 4th year (was ARCH 3017 now ARCH 4026), Art and Architecture in Canada was migrated from Winter 2nd year to Fall 2nd year (ARCH 2036), and Case Studies (ARCH 4006) was migrated from Winter 4th year to Fall 4th year. The calendar descriptions and content of these courses was also revised to respond to the VTR feedback. As well, Sacred Places (ARCH 1007) was revised.
4. The names of some of these courses was also changed to better reflect the content: Canadian Art and Architecture became Art and Architecture in Canada; Writings in Architecture became Writings in Architecture and Urbanism.
5. Additionally, an entirely new course was created and added to the "Cultural Stream," Settlements and Urban Morphology (ARCH 3036), which will address the theory of settlements/cities and their urban form, as this was not addressed in version 1.0 of the Program (more on this below).
   The "Cultural Stream" will start with foundational courses about traditional and vernacular cultures and architecture around the world, moving on the specificity of architecture in Canada, followed by architecture and the city (social and cultural dimensions), and then finally addressing advanced architectural theory (case studies and writings). All these significant modifications will clarify and complete the arc of the "Cultural Stream" courses and strengthen the relationships between these courses and courses from other streams in each of the eight

BAS semesters, which will help ensure that content and assignments and logically building up during the four years of the BAS curriculum.

6. The teaching team in the fourth year design studio (where the comprehensive design SPC D1 is covered) have recalibrated both Integrated Design 1 (ARCH 4505) and Integrated Design 2 (ARCH 4515) design studio courses and deliverables. Both of these courses now include more individual submissions by the students.

Specific Areas of concern were noted in the Program Performance Criteria (PPC) and in the Student Performance Criteria (SPC):

PPC 2 ("Design Education") was met (page 18), however, the team states that "the School is missing important opportunities to further embrace and train the students to the global challenges. One is the relative lack of attention to the urban environment".

In response to this:
Consequently, the course Writings in Architecture (ARCH 3017) was migrated from 3rd year to 4th year and was reframed to provide more attention to the urban environment, which is why it became Writings in Architecture and Urbanism (ARCH 4026). Moreover, this is also why the entirely new course Settlements and Urban Morphology (ARCH 3036) was created, as this will further expand the attention to the urban environment in the BAS. Writings in Architecture and Urbanism will provide advanced theory about the urban environment and how it is relating to architectural theory, Settlements and Urban Morphology (which will come first in the BAS) will differ as this course will only focus on the urban environment and will provide more history into the evolution of settlements and cities and will provide the foundational knowledge to understand how the city form develops. This new course is also essential as it will help obtain one of the few SPCs that were not met in 2021 (more on this below).

PPC 6 "Breadth of Education" was not met (page 21), the team states: "The Program offers a general education to entering students (24 credits, outside of the MSoA) as well as a variety of co-op activities. However, it consists of almost exclusively mandatory architecture courses. Such a situation may be limiting to a broader exposure to international developments in architecture, and also in the choices that students can make (refer to Cause of concern #3, for the Team's recommendations). More opportunities are needed within the discipline of architecture."

In response to this:
Consequently, the MSoA elective courses Topics in Architecture (ARCH 3907) and Advanced Topics in Architecture (ARCH 4906) were created in order to address this issue, i.e. the need to create elective courses in architecture. These courses will thus complement general studies electives that students can take in other LU programs, offering more choices to architectural students for their electives (18 credits requirement in the recalibrated program version 2.0).
SPC A1 "Design Theories, Precedents, and Methods", was met (page 21), however, the team stated that "the strongest instances of articulating an understanding of design analyses were in the Master courses", highlighting the fact that there is room for improvement in how this SPC is met in the BAS.
In response to this:
Consequently, Design Thinking (ARCH 1006) was revised, and this was further reinforced by the creation of an entirely new course that provides more foundational design methods skills. Therefore, the course Drawing (ARCH 1016) will provide students with the history, theory and architectural drawing skills to discover how architects have used the medium to represent buildings, explore their architectural imagination, and support the design process.

SPC A6 “Urban Design” was not met (page 23), the team states that “Overall, the demonstration of urban design in the sense of design responses to large urban contexts was not adequately present in the student work both at the Bachelor and Master levels… Further, there is an insignificant confirmation of understanding and consideration of regulatory systems, urban planning principles, and metropolitan site challenges...”

In response to this:
The creation of the Settlements and Urban Morphology course (ARCH 3036) is essential to the recalibrated program as it should provide something that has been missing in the BAS, in terms of Urban Design. This will provide missing knowledge and skills, but it will also facilitate the integration of quality urban design criteria and deliverables in Design Studios as the lecture course will better prepare students for Studio assignments, thanks to Studios and the lecture course working in synergy.

SPC B2 “Architectural History”, was not met (page 25), the team “expresses serious concerns about the choices made in teaching Architectural History, for instance in not offering a global survey that would include monumental and vernacular history of Western, Latin American, and Eastern architecture (for instance Japanese wood architecture). Similarly, the evolution of urban design is almost entirely absent, with the exception of ARCH 3017 Writing on Architecture with half the curriculum covering issues of 19th and 20th urban design.”

In response to this:
Thus it was essential to revisit the entire “Cultural Stream” that addresses Architectural History. The revised Sacred Places (ARCH 1007) will now provide in an apparent and clear manner a global survey that includes monumental and vernacular history of architecture through time and place (various regions of the world). The revised Building Case Studies (ARCH 4006) will now clearly position this course as a core Architectural History course, focusing on contemporary architecture, as it was unfortunately not included by the CACB in their list of courses demonstrating evidence of Architectural History. The new course Settlements and Urban Morphology (ARCH 3036) should provide more historical content on the evolution of urban design and complement Writings in Architecture and Urbanism (was ARCH 3017, now ARCH 4026).

Summary:
The MSoA was very pleased to earn CACB Initial Accreditation as Canada’s newest school of Architecture, a daunting task given the compounded complexities that the review happened during the pandemic and following the advent of LU’s CCAA proceedings. MSoA was also very pleased that the strengths of the programs were recognized. We have collaboratively and collegially recalibrated courses and the BAS and MArch programs to both best address VTR concerns and respond to our collective institutional experiences delivering the program since 2013. Additionally, with the MSoA Director’s appointment to the CACB as board member she has further understanding, contextually, how other Canadian architecture programs work to maintain accreditation. As Director of the MSoA, of course, recuses herself from any CACB evaluations of the MSoA, however the insight is valuable for MSoA.

It is with great appreciation for members of the MSoA who worked on preparing these documents with the Director, Graduate and Undergraduate Coordinators taking the lead, and appreciation to the SEA Vice-Dean and SEA Dean, members of the SEA Curriculum, SEA Faculty, Grad Council and CELP who proactively helped guide the documents needed to approve the changes for the BAS and the MArch programs.

We look forward to further backing from Laurentian University to best support the sustainable intake of students and growth of the Professional Program's impact with adequate staffing, faculty appointments, security, maintenance and IT.

4. Program Strengths

1. The MSoA has an ambitious and relevant focus on providing a hands-on learning experience that celebrates its local tricultural identity. It makes a strong contribution to global architectural education and is rightly recognized by LU administrators as being one of LU's "jewels". Its engagement with Indigenous knowledge is now being followed by other universities.
2. Through its faculty- and student-led engagement with its local Sudbury community, the MSoA has strongly positioned itself as an important civic actor and as the community engaged public face for LU.
3. In addition to contributing to Sudbury's urban life, the School's internationally recognized purpose-built facility serves as a learning tool.
4. The solidarity of faculty, staff, and students in their dedication to the mission of the School is impressive. The MSoA's focus on a deep understanding of craft and the collaborative atmosphere promote a reconfiguration of traditional hierarchical relations between architects and building trades.
5. The MSoA benefits from the engagement of its International Advisory Board and major donors Rob and Cheryl McEwen.
6. Student work displays a strong and well-balanced architectural education with minimal pedagogical gaps, highlighting the Program's unique approach to the technical and conceptual explorations of materials and to urban and regional networks. The VT sees major opportunities for the MSoA to become a global leader in a critical exploration of ecological and industrial developments

5. Causes of Concern and Team's recommendations

1. The relation between the MSoA and the wider LU is complicated by the lingering effects of insolvency, resulting in misunderstandings about the identity and requirements of the Program, as developed in the original business plan agreed upon between the community and LU.
2. LU benefits from the MSoA being its community-engaged public face, but faculty and students express that the challenges that come with this engagement are not sufficiently understood and supported by the LU's administration. See 3.8.
3. The 2021 VT's concerns about the insufficient number of staff and faculty remains an important issue that impacts the MSoA's community-engaged mission, pedagogical objectives, student well-being and enrichment, faculty research, and efficient use of the building and equipment. See 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.10.
4. The relation between the MSoA and its community was compromised by the insolvency crisis. Efforts are made to remediate this situation, but consequences such as the significant decline in the number of undergraduate students could impact the MSoA's financial stability and targeted number of faculty.
5. The VT has concerns about the impact on students of insufficient support to the co-op experience. See 3.10.
6. Major cuts to LU academic programs have strongly limited the availability of electives outside of MSoA. See 3.10 and PPC6. In recent years, the Program has not been able to completely fulfill the expectations that come with its tricultural mandate. See 3.3, PPC2, PPC 3 and PPC

III. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

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

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

The Program's Report is very detailed and provides candid observations on every condition and criteria. Student work seems accurately represented, with examples of low pass assignments that are an honest reflection of low pass submissions.
Detailed responses to surveys sent to current MSoA students, MSoA MArch alumni, MSoA full time faculty and co-op employers of MSoA students are provided, as well as analysis of these responses.
The Program's report provides a description of its self-assessment process. Since the last visit, the Program has been reviewed following a structured process to address the previous visit's concerns and make other changes to its structure, covering the four streams of the curriculum

2. Public Information
The Program must provide clear, complete, and accurate information to the public and include the following text in its official Program information.

"In Canada, the Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CACB) is the sole agency authorized by the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities (CALA) to accredit Canadian professional degree programs in architecture for the purposes of architectural licensure."

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

The information required by the CACB is provided in the Program's Report and easily available on the Program's website. Information about the SPCs is present in every syllabus.

3. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
The Program must conform to provincial and institutional policies that augment and clarify the provisions of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms as they apply to social equity. Policies in place that are specific to the school or professional Program should be clearly stated, as well as the means by which the policies are communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Report provided by the Program indicates commitment to EDI at both the University and Faculty levels. Faculty, staff and student members reflect good male/female ratios, strategies for supporting Indigenous members, visible minorities, and French speaking members. This diverse student body contributes to the life of the MSoA and the School appears to be working to improve these ratios/numbers even more, for example through a summer camp for high school students and outreach to communities they are not yet in contact with.
Expectations related to the tricultural mandate are not fully supported within the school.
Francophone students mentioned that the School is not delivering enough of the program in French, with some of the French studio sections originally planned to be offered yearly being cut due to the smaller number of students choosing them than planned.
Four faculty members departed the university. Two of them were Indigenous faculty and only one has been replaced.
Access to Elders and Knowledge Carriers has diminished since the insolvency. Some students

and faculty have expressed that there is currently a lack of support and resources for Indigenous students, however challenges are being addressed through rebuilding the relationship between LU and Indigenous communities / partners.

4. Student Composition, Well-Being, and Enrichment

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, as well as an interpersonal milieu that embraces cultural differences. The Program must demonstrate that it benefits from and contributes to its institutional values.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Evidence in the Program's Report, onsite meetings with the director, faculty, LASA and students provide ample evidence that the MSoA is supporting and encouraging their student body to the best of their current abilities. As noted in sections 3.3 and 3.5, the Visiting Team has concerns related to the institutional support to satisfactorily support students relating to the tricultural mandate. This is evident in comments from Indigenous students noting the limited presence of Elders and Knowledge Carriers at the School and in comments from Francophone students regarding the limited offering of French studios. Both of these are issues that were exacerbated by the insolvency process. The student body of the MSoA at the time of this report was 3% Indigenous and 6% French and these ratios were reduced from previous years.

The MSoA's high recruitment efforts and ARCHI North summer camp program are initiatives by the faculty to attract more students.

As a satellite to the main LU campus, the MSoA does not have student services on site and students have to commute to the main campus to access these services. The School's dedicated teaching and administrative support team covers some of these needs, but their current engagement beyond their core responsibilities in the well-being of students cannot be guaranteed in the long term.

Overall the students reported passion for the community, colleagues and curriculum of the MSoA and felt a strong sense of support from the community..

5. Faculty and Staff Resources

The Program must demonstrate that it provides adequate human resources for a professional degree program in architecture, including a sufficient complement of appropriately qualified faculty, administrative, and support staff, and an administrative head that devotes no less than fifty percent of his or her time to program administration.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☐ **Not Met** ☑

The MSoA is supported by a well-balanced group of faculty and sessionals,with diverse experiences in research or practice. Support staff are dedicated and resourceful.

The 2021 VTR noted that "the number of administrative staff is already insufficient to adequately support the School [...], and is in urgent need for an IT support analyst." Three years later, positions identified in 2021 (IT support, digital fabrication technician, librarian, additional coop supervisor) have yet to be filled and there are additional needs for administrative and outreach support, limiting student services.

Faculty persist in their commitment to the School's successes, but the need to cover for tasks not currently served by staff impacts their teaching and limits their ability to fully pursue research that can contribute to their teaching and to the outside recognition of the School as a leading institution. The APR states that the required 15:1 student ratio in studios is barely maintained and some students

report a lack of feedback from overwhelmed faculty. Furthermore, if the MSoA being downtown is an important asset to LU, it adds pressure to the MSoA's Director whose high administrative load combines the responsibilities of urban campus manager with those of an academic program leader. Discussions with MSoA and LU administrators have shown differing understandings of the specific requirements of architectural education in comparison with other academic units within the university.

6. Space and Technology 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 a variety of learning modalities, office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member, and related instructional support space. The Program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to appropriate visual, digital, and fabrication resources that support professional education in architecture.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

The Program is housed within a dedicated, award-winning, purpose-built facility with state-of-theart visual, digital, and fabrication resources. However, as stated under condition 3.5, the limited number of support staff impacts how efficiently the facility and equipment can be used. While the building was designed using projected student numbers that have not been achieved yet, the Program reports that in its current configuration there is barely enough studio space for its targeted number of students. There are plans in place for growth (through using spaces currently rented on the ground floor of the Telegraph building) as new faculty and staff are hired and more students are admitted.

7. Information Resources

The Program must provide ample, diverse, and up-to-date resources for faculty, staff, and students to support research and skills acquisition. The Program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to literature and information resources that support professional education in architecture and access to librarians, visual resource, and information technology professionals who provide services, teach, and develop skills related to each of these resources.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

The architecture library, housed within the MSoA building, is an important asset to the School. The library also engages with the community, for example through a collection of drawings from important buildings of the Sudbury area placed at the entrance of the library.
However, echoing the concerns in 3.5, there is a major concern regarding the staff support for information resources. A discussion with the LU library network acting librarian was informative if inconclusive. The University Librarian confirmed that the library can respond to requests for books and material rapidly, but that the current number of librarians in the library network does not allow for a dedicated architecture librarian, even for a part-time presence. The current acting University Librarian has never visited the architecture library.
In discussions with students, a number of individual students appreciated the engagement with a library assistant, but underlined they missed the usefulness and highly beneficial learning experience of one-to-one engagement with a librarian that could help with research thesis and contribute to courses. Because of the limited availability of the small team of librarians covering the whole LU library network, there has not been opportunities in recent years for librarians to contribute to MSoA courses, shifting the teaching of information resources to MSoA faculty. The concerns identified by students have also been present in discussions with the faculty.

8. Financial Resources

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

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☐ **Not Met** ☑

This condition is not met in relation to the institutional support from LU central administration. The APR contains a detailed financial outline that paints a picture of the MSoA being in good financial health, with a surplus of revenue over expenses of approximately $2 million. In the current budgeting model used by the university, revenue generated at MSoA is shared with other departments. Some funds, such as the McEwen endowment or revenue generated from the rental of MSoA spaces, are kept within the school and are used to fund experiential learning opportunities, scholarships, and grants, but cannot be used to fill faculty and staff positions, as these appointments are decided at the University level. Enrollment at the undergraduate level is lower than projected, impacting negotiations between the MSoA and LU regarding sessionals and faculty appointments.

While MSoA is in good financial health, there are misunderstandings regarding required support at the institutional level. Faculty and students feel isolated and forgotten by the main campus. Faculty complained that LU upper administration does not understand the nature of architectural education. Faculty observed that they have to constantly advocate for resources and support that are standard at other schools of architecture (for example, dedicated librarian, digital fabrication technologist, portfolio submission platform, etc.), causing frustration, tension, and an erosion of trust between LU and MSoA..

9. Administrative Structure (Academic Unit & Institution)

The Program must be part of an institution accredited for higher education by the authority having jurisdiction in its province. The Program must have a degree of autonomy that is comparable to that afforded to the other relevant professional programs in the institution and sufficient to ensure conformance with the requirements of the CACB Conditions and Terms for Accreditation.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Evidence of the Program's autonomy was provided in discussions with both the School's Director and the university's administration. Furthermore, the presence of both a School Council and an International Advisory Board - linked to the major donation received by the School, one of only a few within its institution - underlines how processes have been put in place to provide high-level guidance for the Program.

LU central administration sees the MSoA as “a jewel of the university” with an important role to play in community engagement. The University’s administration understands the School as being best positioned for recruitment outreach and has confidence that the School’s current strategic plan is very forward-looking. The School’s administrators confirm that they have great autonomy in curriculum and operations decision, with help from a very involved International Advisory Board, but that the challenges of running both the academic program and the operations of a satellite campus, as well as the particularities of an architecture program with a tricultural mandate (studio size, registration periods, etc.) are sometimes not appropriately recognized by the central administration.

10. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

The CACB only awards accreditation to professional degree Programs in architecture.
A CACB-accredited professional Program in architecture is defined as the totality of a student’s post-secondary education culminating in a designated professional university degree, which may be a bachelor of architecture (B. Arch) or a master of architecture (M. Arch) degree.

The Programs include:

- *a minimum of five years of post-secondary study culminating in a master of architecture degree, which follows a pre-professional bachelor's degree, except in Quebec, where the minimum is four years of professional studies following two years of CEGEP;*
- *a minimum of six years of post-secondary study culminating in a master of architecture degree, which follows a bachelor's degree in any discipline and includes a minimum of three years of professional studies in architecture; or*
- *a minimum of five years of post-secondary study culminating in a bachelor of architecture degree.*

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

The APR provides detailed information about the 4+2 structure of the program (two-year M.Arch, preceded by a four-year pre-professional BAS), as well as information regarding admissions, advanced placement, and criteria for transfer students coming into the M.Arch as either Advanced Standing or Qualifying Year. The structure of the program and distribution of coursework are within the parameters required by CACB. The co-op program is described, including placement rates.

This experience is an asset of the Program and appreciated by students, many having chosen the School to profit from this experience. However, the number of students supported by the coop placement coordinator throughout the Faculty of SEA is in some years over double the standards of CEWIL Canada. This overextended workload of the coordinator impacts the provision of adequate support that responds to the requirements of the MSoA curriculum. Students mentioned that the lack of sustained access to a network of trusting partners in practice limits the opportunities actually offered to them in this mandatory element of the curriculum. Some students have had to make adjustments to their studies timeline to achieve the co-op requirements.

Information about electives available within and outside of the Program is provided. The VT is concerned that the choices of study options is limited, a concern that remains from the 2021 observations. See PPC6 for a detailed discussion of this.

11. Performance Criteria

The Program must demonstrate satisfactory performance in relation to program performance criteria (PPC), and student performance criteria (SPC) as detailed below. The CACB does not specify the structure and content of educational programs nor the forms of evidence used to satisfy the criteria. Programs are therefore encouraged to develop unique learning and teaching strategies, methods, and materials to satisfy these criteria.

For PPCs, evidence of performance may take many diverse forms not limited to course work and its outcomes. The Program must describe and demonstrate that it creates an environment in which these criteria are satisfied.

For SPCs, evidence of performance must include student work and the pedagogical objectives and assignments of any given course. With respect to fulfilling the criteria, the Program must demonstrate that all of its graduates have achieved, at minimum, a satisfactory level of accomplishment.

The roster of six PPCs and twenty-four SPCs is intended to foster an integrated approach to learning. Their order is not intended to imply a weight assigned to each.

11.1 Program Performance Criteria

The Program must provide its students with a well-thought-out curriculum with educational opportunities that include general studies, professional studies, and elective studies.
Each of the PPCs must be addressed in a clear narrative statement and with reference to any relevant supporting documentation.

PPC 1. Professional Development

The Program must demonstrate its approach to engaging with the profession and exposing students to a breadth of professional opportunities and career paths, including the transition to internship and licensure.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Students engage with the profession and are exposed to a breadth of professional opportunities in the 4 co-op terms, which combine for a total of 56 weeks of employment in a variety of handson and more traditional placements. Evidence of this exposure is provided in the preparation for employment applications, reporting during the work terms and follow-up reporting by both the student and the employer.
ARCH 5906 Architectural Practice covers CHOP material. The course work demonstrates exposure to the profession and various types of architectural practice. The program solicits OAA practitioners to visit and the current OAA Senior VP is on the MSoA faculty.
It is of importance to reiterate comments noted in the Causes of Concern above and condition 3.10 that the current lack of a dedicated co-op coordinator within MSoA creates an added burden on students to find a co-op placement. The co-op placements are a mandatory requirement and there is a concern that students can get delayed in their graduation if they are not able to secure placements. The School's administrative support staff helps the faculty-wide co-op coordinator, but discussions with staff and students suggest that at least one fully dedicated coordinator is needed to support the 130-160 MSoA students who are required to do co-op placement each year.

PPC 2. Design Education

The Program must demonstrate how it situates and values education and training in design at the core of the curriculum, including the ways in which the design curriculum weaves together the social, technical, and professional streams of the curriculum.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

A hands-on approach to design embedded in Sudbury's local context is at the core of the curriculum. The curriculum follows a logical sequence, culminating in integrated design that encompass practical and conceptual aspects of architecture. Hands-on, experiential learning is very evident throughout student work. Both the co-op experience and focus on collaborative approaches appear to strongly influence students and to impact their understanding of the role of the diverse actors of the building industry, from designers to builders. Hand and digital drawing courses and requirements are both relevant.
The tricultural mandate is a unique focus of the School's identity. It attracts students and offers them unique learning opportunities that students say have served them well in co-op placements where they feel confident to question traditional approaches to design. However, many students and faculty have underlined that the Program has not been able in recent years to completely fulfill the expectations that come with this mandate and to consistently offer a French section of its studios or to integrate Elders and Knowledge Carriers in courses.

Limited financial and human resources impact the more ambitious aspects of the School's mission, but at its core, the Program very successfully brings together the social, technical and professional aspects of architecture through a close enmeshing of traditional and vernacular knowledge with contemporary techniques..

PPC 3. Global Perspectives and Environmental Stewardship
The Program must demonstrate how it embraces the diverse contexts that define contemporary architecture, including local, global, and environmental interests.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

The student work shows evidence of the school's holistic approach to sustainability, Environmental, ecological and Indigenous knowledge. The MSoA's tricultural mandate allows students to understand the diverse contexts in which contemporary architects practice. However, as stated in PPC 2, many students and faculty have underlined that the Program has not been able in recent years to successfully address the different challenges of engaging with the specific needs of Indigenous and Francophone communities.
The VT acknowledges that the MSoA has incorporated feedback from the 2021 VTR to diversify the urban and global conditions in its curriculum and is confident that the Program has a clear path for further diversification of the global contexts addressed in courses. The teaching of urban design principles for metropolitan site challenges (density development, brownfield conditions, transit-oriented development, complex by-law implementation) does not appear to be consistent, but they are present in some studios. Student work at the graduate level, including in many theses, shows an engagement with a variety of global perspectives.

PPC 4. Collaboration, Leadership, and Community Engagement
The Program must demonstrate how it supports and fosters effective individual and team dynamics, a spirit of collaboration and inclusion, community engagement, and diverse approaches to leadership.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Collaboration is emphasized and evidenced in the studio work. Community engagement is a core objective of the School that students embrace through numerous events. MSoA's success in this area was confirmed by LU administration, as well by students expressing how it has helped them in their co-op placement. Nuit Blanche, Smooth Rock Falls in Studio ARCH 3515 and work with the Sudbury Sustainability Committee in graduate studio Craft ARCH 5525 are examples. The structure of the curriculum focused on a deep understanding of design-build and craft, the collaborative atmosphere between staff, faculty and students, the early integration of design building projects, and the requirement of a hands-on co-op placement promote a reconfiguration of traditional hierarchical relations between architects and other actors of the building industry, including trades. While favorably impressed with the quality of the student work and their dedication to collaboration, the VT sometimes had difficulty assessing how students were performing on an individual basis as many assignments were group assignments, a concern already identified by the 2021 visiting team. However, the team was provided with examples of peer evaluations used to balance individual grades that address aspects of this concern and that show that students are developing skills in evaluating their contribution to team efforts..

PPC 5. Technical Knowledge
The Program must describe how it engages fundamental and emerging technical aspects of building construction.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

There is evidence that students are learning the fundamental principles of construction through analysis and design for assignments in ARCH 1306 Wood Structures, ARCH 2336 Building Systems I and ARCH 4316 Building Systems II.
Evidence of student engagement in emerging technical aspects of construction are seen in studio and built work completed in the Ice Station project, ARCH 3326 Digital Fabrication and ARCH 5326 Making 2 Fabrication..

PPC 6. Breadth of Education
The Program must demonstrate how it provides an opportunity for students to participate in general studies and elective studies in the pursuit of a broad understanding of human knowledge and a deeper study of topics within the discipline of architecture.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☐ **Not Met** ☑

The 2021 VTR marked this criteria as not met, noting the need for more opportunities outside of mandatory architecture courses. The Program reports structural changes made to the curriculum to address these concerns by spreading electives throughout the curriculum and moving optional seminars to the undergraduate level, but the limited number of faculty keeps the choice of electives low.

However, the combination of major cuts to LU programs outside of the MSoA and scheduling conflicts - in part due to transportation time to main campus - limit the availability of electives outside of the School. Students also report that opportunities for minors in Indigenous Studies or in Environmental Studies, two topics closely linked to the vision of the MSoA, are no longer available. There have also been concerns stated by students, faculty and administration that links to the Indigenous communities have been more difficult to sustain following COVID an insolvency.

The VT is concerned that the choice of study options offering a broader understanding of human knowledge beyond architecture remains limited. The VT recognizes the structural challenges in addressing these issues and commends the School for developing graduate optional studios that expose students to a diversity of contexts. Thesis examples provided as well as assignments in courses such as ARCH 5086 Material Culture and ARCH 4016 Cultural Sustainability highlight the range of topics that students are encouraged to explore.
I.

11.2. Student Performance Criteria

A. Design

A1. Design Theories, Precedents, and Methods
The student must demonstrate an ability to articulate a design process grounded in theory and practice, an understanding of design principles and methods, and the critical analysis of architectural precedents.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
Evidence is found in the M. Arch thesis (ARCH 5555/5565) and 4th year comprehensive design studio (ARCH 4505/4515), expanding and developing knowledge acquired in foundation courses such as ARCH 3515 Studio 6: Northern Building II.
While there is evidence of the criteria being met, the VT notes that an emphasis on indigenous design theories, precedents, and methods, related to the MSoA tricultural mandate, was not as visible as expected.

A2. Design Skills
The student must demonstrate an ability to apply design theories, methods, and precedents to the conception, configuration, and design of buildings, spaces, building elements, and tectonic components.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
Evidence is found in the M. Arch thesis (ARCH 5555/5565) and 4th year comprehensive design studio (ARCH 4505/4515), with design skills developed in foundation courses such as ARCH 2515 Studio 4: Landscape II as well as in fabrication courses such as ARCH 5306 Making 1.
But, as per 2021 VTR, the VT notes that while ARCH 4505 has good contextual analysis and programming, the concept design seems to arrive without a clearly delineated parti, perhaps as a result of group work.

A3. Design Tools
The student must demonstrate an ability to use the broad range of design tools available to the architectural discipline, including a range of techniques for two-dimensional and three-dimensional representation, computational design, modeling, simulation, and fabrication.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
There is evidence that students are being taught design tools including hand drawing, modeling, sketching, and use of digital tools including Rhino, and Adobe software in ARCH 4006 Building Case Study, ARCH 4306 Digital Fabrication, ARCH 4316 Building Systems II, ARCH 5306 Fabrication I, ARCH 5505 Architecture and Craft where computer skills and hands-on log carpentry skills were used by a group of 12 to build a bridge.
There is a concern from students regarding instruction on digital tools used in professional practice such as AutoDesk products (Revit and AutoCAD). Design tools related to professional practice are learned through co-op terms, but students expressed concerns that they were having difficulties finding co-op placements without having basic knowledge of these widely-used software.

A4. Program Analysis

The student must demonstrate an ability to analyze and respond to a complex program for an architectural project that accounts for client and user needs, appropriate precedents, space and equipment requirements, the relevant laws, and site selection and design assessment criteria.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Evidence of criteria being met can be found in ARCH 1017 Indigenous Precedents, ARCH 2515 Landscape studio, ARCH 5306 Making 1 and ARCH 5326 Making 2, as well as studios ARCH 3505, ARCH 4505, and ARCH 5565.

A5. Site Context and Design

The student must demonstrate an ability to analyze and respond to local site characteristics, including urban, non-urban, and regulatory contexts; topography; ecological systems; climate; and building orientation in the development of an architectural design project.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Site Context and Design is emphasized in the second year of the undergraduate program in studio ARCH 2515. That is expanded in the latter years to include site analysis and mapping work in studios ARCH 4505, ARCH 5555, and ARCH 5565..

A6. Urban Design

The student must demonstrate an ability to analyze and respond to the larger urban context where architecture is situated; its developmental patterning and spatial morphologies; the infrastructural, environmental, and ecological systems; to understand the regulatory instruments that govern this context; the broader implications of architectural design decisions on the evolution of cities; and the impact of urbanism on design.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

The 2021 VTR outlined noncompliance with this SPC. Since the 2021 accreditation visit, MSoA has added a new course, ARCH 3036 Settlements and Urban Morphology to focus specifically on the history, theory and practical application of urban design.
While ARCH 3036 focuses specifically on urban design, each design studio has incorporated urban design coursework as part of the development of a studio project. In addition, M.Arch option studios provide immersive urban experiences through the study and experience of various cities as part of studio field trips (Denmark, England, India, Finland, etc.**)** .

A7. Detail Design

The student must demonstrate an ability to assess, as an integral part of design, the appropriate combinations of materials, components, and assemblies in the development of detailed architectural elements through drawing, modeling, and/or full-scale prototypes.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Evidence can be found throughout the undergraduate program in studios ARCH 4316 and ARCH 4515. Each design-build project has a component of detail design to transform conceptual ideas into physical manifestations. In addition, design studio ARCH 5505 and

ARCH 5306 Making 1 and ARCH 5326 Making 2 incorporate detailed design as part of the overall resolution of a comprehensive design project.

A8. Design Documentation
The student must demonstrate an ability to document and present the outcome of a design project using the broad range of architectural media, including documentation for the purposes of construction, drawings, and specifications.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
Evidence of design documentation is evident throughout undergraduate and graduate programs. Each design-build project has a component of design documentation to transform conceptual ideas into physical manifestations. In addition, 4th year design studio incorporates design documentation as part of the overall resolution of the comprehensive design project. These are studios ARCH 4316, ARCH 4515, ARCH 5326 and ARCH 5306.

B. Culture, Communications, and Critical Thinking

B1. Critical Thinking and Communication
The student must demonstrate an ability to raise clear and precise questions; record, assess, and comparatively evaluate information; synthesize research findings and test potential alternative outcomes against relevant criteria and standards; reach well-supported conclusions related to a specific project or assignment; and write, speak, and use visual media effectively to appropriately communicate on subject matter related to the architectural discipline within the profession and with the general public.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
Student work provided ample evidence that students are able to think critically and reach conclusions, and communicate effectively both visually (by hand and digitally) and in writing. This was particularly visible in ARCH 4006 Building Case Studies, ARCH 4016 Cultural Sustainability, ARCH 4505/4515 (Integrated Design studio), ARCH 5006 Architectural Theory Seminar, and M. Arch thesis (ARCH 5555/5565)..

B2. Architectural History
The student must have an understanding of the history of architecture and urban design in regard to cultural, political, ecological, and technological factors that have influenced their development.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
The 2021 visiting team reported that this criteria was not met. The concerns about not addressing sufficiently “monumental and vernacular history of Western, Latin American, and Eastern architecture (for instance Japanese wood architecture)” have been taken into account by the Program. Evidence was found in ARCH 1007 Sacred Places and ARCH 4006 Building Case Studies that the School has successfully integrated these elements while keeping its focus on a non-traditional and inclusive approach to teaching architectural history that directly links to its tricultural mandate and to changing attitudes in architectural history to understanding a diversity of experiences and perspectives. The impact of this approach to architectural history is also visible in the precedents chosen by students in their thesis.

B3. Architectural Theory
The student must have an understanding of conceptual and theoretical frameworks and how they have shaped architecture and urban design.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
Evidence is found in ARCH 4006 Building Case Studies, ARCH 4016 Cultural Sustainability, ARCH 4026 Writings in Architecture and Urbanism, ARCH 5006 Architectural Theory Seminar, and M.Arch Thesis (ARCH 5555/5565).

B4. Cultural Diversity and Global Perspectives
The student must have an understanding of the diverse needs, values, behavioural norms, and social/spatial patterns that characterize different global cultures and individuals and the implications of diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
Evidence is found in ARCH 1007 Sacred Places, ARCH 4016 Cultural Sustainability, ARCH 4026 Writings in Architecture and Urbanism, ARCH 4505/4515 Integrated Design Studio, and M.Arch Thesis (ARCH 5555/5565). The VT notes that the MSoA's context offers great potential for work addressing this criteria to explore how the experience of Sudbury's mining economy and re-greening effort can be leveraged to investigate larger geopolitical transformations.

B5. Ecological Systems
The student must have an understanding of the broader ecologies that inform the design of buildings and their systems and of the interactions among these ecologies and design decisions.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
The MSoA is in a unique ecological / industrial geographical context that forms part of the school's identity. Evidence is found in that this criteria is specifically met in second year courses ARCH 2515 Studio 4: Landscape II and ARCH 2326 Architecture and Ecology, with knowledge applied to upper year courses through site analysis exercises.

C. Technical Knowledge

C1. Regulatory Systems
The student must have an understanding of the applicable building codes, regulations, and standards for a given building and site, including universal design standards and the principles that inform the design and selection of life-safety systems.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
Students are first introduced to this in ARCH 2515 Landscape II and then in studios ARCH 3505/3515 Northern Building I and II and ARCH 4515 Integrated Design Studio. Graduate students get further experience in co-ops 3 and 4 (ARCH 5915/5925) and ARCH 5906 Architectural Practice.

C2. Materials

The student must have an understanding of the basic principles used in the appropriate selection and application of architectural materials as it relates to fundamental performance, aesthetics, durability, energy, resources, and environmental impact.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Evidence is found in 4306 Digital Fabrication, ARCH 4316 Building Systems II, ARCH 4515 Integrated Design Studio, ARCH 5306/5326 (Making I and II) and M. Arch co-ops (ARCH 5915/5925).

C3. Structural Systems

The student must have an understanding of the principles of structural behavior in withstanding gravitational, seismic, and lateral forces, including the selection and application of appropriate structural systems.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

ARCH 2316 Wood Structures and ARCH 3316 Structures and Material Behavior provide evidence that students have an understanding of the principles, forces and terms related to structural systems. Later year courses include ARCH 4316 Building Systems II, ARCH 4306 Digital Fabrication, ARCH 5306/5326 (Making I and II), as well as optional graduate studios ARCH 5505/5515/5525.

The 2021 VTR's concern about students' exposure to concrete or steel design is being addressed in ARCH 3316 Structures and Material Behaviour, but could be developed even more throughout the curriculum.

C4. Envelope Systems

The student must have an understanding of the basic principles used in the design of building envelope systems and associated assemblies relative to fundamental performance, aesthetics, durability, energy, material resources, and environmental impact.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Courses ARCH 3306 Well Tempered Environment and ARCH 4316 Building Systems II provide clear evidence that students have a good understanding of the components of envelope assemblies, their purpose and performance characteristics (aesthetics, energy, and environmental impact). Evidence is also found in ARCH 4515 Integrated Design Studio and ARCH 5306 Making 1.

C5. Environmental Systems

The student must have an understanding of the basic principles that inform the design of passive and active environmental modification and building service systems, the issues involved in the coordination of these systems in a building, energy use and appropriate tools for performance assessment, and the codes and regulations that govern their application in buildings.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Evidence of is found in ARCH 4316 Building Systems II. ARCH 4505/4515 Integrated Design Studio show good understanding of passive systems. More evidence of active systems would be beneficial.

D: Comprehensive Design

D1. Comprehensive Design

The student must demonstrate an ability to produce an architectural design based on a concept, a building program, and a site which broadly integrates contextual factors, structural and environmental systems, building envelopes and assemblies, regulatory requirements, and environmental stewardship.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Evidence is found in ARCH 4505/4515 Integrated Design Studio, including impressive examples of issues often relegated to the margins of student work, such as site design, code analysis, integration of accessibility, and development and integration of building envelope, structural, lighting and HVAC assemblies.
As per 2021 VTR comments, the VT remains concerned that much work is carried out as group work ranging between 2 and 5 students. However, peer evaluations used by faculty to assess individual contributions to the work submitted address parts of this concern..

E: Professional Practice

E1. The Architectural Profession

The student must have an understanding of the organization of the profession, the Architects Act(s) and its regulations, the role of regulatory bodies, the paths to licensure including internship, and the reciprocal rights and responsibilities of interns and employers.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

There is clear evidence in ARCH 5906 Architectural Practice of sufficient exposure to the profession, paths to licensure and the topics of professional practice required. Co-op work placements are good examples of what a student experiences and is exposed to in the profession.

E2. Ethical and Legal Responsibilities

The student must have an understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment; the architect's legal responsibility under the laws, codes, regulations, and contracts common to the practice of architecture; intellectual property rights; and the role of advocacy in relation to environmental, social, and cultural issues.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Courses ARCH 4016 Cultural Sustainability and ARCH 5906 Architectural Practice provide good evidence of social, cultural and environmental responsibilities and advocacy and illustrate understanding and exposure to many aspects of professional practice (fees, contracts, schedules).
This is also found in co-op (ARCH 5915 and ARCH 5925) preparation and follow-up reports. The architect's role as an advocate for the environment and social issues is seen in many of the studio courses.

E3. Modes of Practice

The student must have an understanding of the basic principles and types of practice organization, including financial management, business planning, entrepreneurship, marketing, negotiation, project management, and risk mitigation, as well as an understanding of trends that affect the practice.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

It is clear that through ARCH 5906 Architectural Practice, students are exposed to many of the requirements of the modes, or 'business', of practice. Depending on the students' particular work placements and exposure to aspects of practice, these topics are also reinforced through the coop work placements and reports ARCH 5915 and ARCH 5925 to varying degrees.

E4. Professional Contracts

The student must have an understanding of the various contracts common to the practice of architecture.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

ARCH 5906 Architectural Practice provides evidence of an awareness/understanding of a typical Architect-Client agreement, in this case OAA 800, and associated fee calculation, project scope and schedule. Co-op experiences provides further exposure to contracts if students are permitted to be part of that during their employment term.

E5. Project Management

The student must have an understanding of the relationships among key stakeholders in the design process; the methods for selecting consultants and assembling teams; building economics and cost control strategies; the development of work plans and project schedules; and project delivery methods.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐

Early exposure to Project Management is provided in ARCH 1505 Design Studio 1 Place. ARCH 5906 Architectural Practice reflects exposure to most of the required criteria. Co-ops (ARCH 5915 and ARCH 5925) offer possible reinforcement of criteria depending on the firm. ARCH 5306/5326 (Making 1 and 2) do not illustrate the criteria directly, however issues such as economics and cost control, work plans, project schedules, etc. are inherent in the assignments at a different/smaller scale.

IV. Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

The following is condensed from the Program's Architecture Program Report

1- Brief History of Laurentian University

The identity and unique features of the McEwen School of Architecture are publically shared on our website: https://mcewenarchitecture.ca/identity /

2- Institutional Mission

The philosophy of our Program is founded upon pride of place and a culture of caring. We are inspired by the resiliency of northern people and the unique beauty of the northern Ontario landscape. Applying the lessons learned in the North in ways that inform a reciprocal relationship between the local and the global, we place pedagogical emphasis on social engagement, community design, cultural identity, sustainability, Indigenous perspectives, design-build and craft, technology and fabrication and wood construction.
The MSoA grounds itself in shared values of RESPECT, INCLUSION and COMMUNITY. The Program reaches beyond Laurentian University's tricultural mandate (Indigenous, Francophone and Anglophone), further emphasizing diversity and equity as central to our Program..

3- Program History

The Project Mission, from the School of Architecture's "Project Charter" (2012), stated:
The Laurentian University School of Architecture, or, Laurentian Architecture Laurentienne (LAL), is the first new architecture school to open in Canada in over 40 years. LAL will become a ground-breaking academic institution that, through activism, research, and engagement, will develop new knowledge and innovation positively altering the way people of northern communities live, learn and grow.

4- Program Mission

Mission at MSoA;
The mission of the McEwen School of Architecture (MSoA) is, first and foremost, to educate succeeding generations of architects to engage with communities in the design of sustainable buildings within the geographic and cultural context of the North. Through this process of exploration and discovery, the school fosters an ongoing dialogue with its civic and academic community so that ideas about sustainability reflect emerging realities.
The philosophy of our Program is founded upon pride of place and a culture of caring. We are inspired by the resiliency of northern people and the unique beauty of the northern Ontario landscape. Applying the lessons learned in the North in ways that inform a reciprocal relationship between the local and the global, we place pedagogical emphasis on social engagement, community design, cultural identity, sustainability, Indigenous perspectives, design-build and craft, technology and fabrication and wood construction.

5- Program Action Plan

the Program's action plan and objectives developed in accordance with institutional norms; and In the Spring of 2023, the MSoA School Council met in a retreat to develop and vote in the new MSoA Strategic Plan Goals 2023-2028.

The Following text was co-written and unanimously supported by MSoA Faculty at the retreat:
"Building upon our existing pillars of Respect, Inclusion, and Community, by 2028, the McEwen School of Architecture aspires to:
Ensure that the MSoA is a recognized centre of architectural education, research, and professional training in the north, committed to CACB accreditation standards, that produces future leaders with regional, national, and international impact. Cultivating our visibility and strong reputation, we aim to increase numbers of applicants, strong partner relationships, and co-op placements;
Maintain, expand, and promote our culture of environmental stewardship, ecology, and sustainability in design;
Reinforce our circular material culture
Develop stewardship and sustainability in our MArch curriculum
Maintain, expand, and promote our culture of making and design-build at all scales;
Grow our experiential learning initiatives and foster research opportunities ·
Expand design-build initiatives
Establish a mobile workshop to ensure geographic mobility
Initiate knowledge sharing and continuity
Maintain, expand, and promote our comprehensive architectural pedagogy and research in wood building materials and technologies;
Support and develop our Wood Institute and integrate it into our curriculum and research
Expand wood initiatives
Reinforce teaching and research within Laurentian University's forest
Secure additional space to support pedagogy, research and fabrication

Strengthen our capacity for community engagement through design with local and remote northern partners; Establish community design processes within the curriculum
Continue, establish, and mobilise new partnerships in the north and with indigenous and francophone communities.
Initiate Knowledge sharing and continuity
Centre Indigenous worldviews and land-based practices as foundational values in architectural education;
Increase and support recruitment of Indigenous faculty and students
Maintain Indigenous content in our pedagogy
Cultivate a dynamic Indigenous community of students and exposure to indigenous worldviews within broader School community.
Expand working relationships with regional Indigenous communities
Support and enhance francophone cultures at the School and within the Francophonie and the larger community;
Increase and support recruitment of francophone faculty and students
Maintain dedicated French Language (FL) studios
Cultivate a dynamic francophone community of students and exposure to francophone culture and perspective with the broader School community.
Grow and expand our culture of accessibility and inclusion in design
Develop and support global perspective in our pedagogy of research
Develop and support social and spatial justice, and decolonial practices in our pedagogy and research
Establish and develop global connections in teaching and scholarship
Support cultural fluency and exchange.

This updated mission statement and strategic plan for MSoA builds upon and nuances further, given the developed trajectory of MSoA, and the previous MSoA Strategic Plan Goals, 2018-22, summarized below:

The six (6) goals of the MSoA Strategic Plan (2018-2022) was agreed on by the School Council as per University norms:
Building upon our existing pillars of RESPECT, INCLUSION and COMMUNITY, by 2022 the McEwen School of Architecture aspires to:
Create an internationally recognized architectural "Hub" as an umbrella for teaching, research and community engagement;
Establish leadership in Design-Build culture, hands-on active learning, and collaborative research-creation;
Strengthen our capacity for "Community responsiveness" in northern and remote environments through community partnerships;
Become the leading architecture school in Canada for Indigenous design;
Become the leading architecture school in Canada in new wood technologies in the boreal forest region;
Enrich Francophone culture by remaining the only School of Architecture outside of Québec to offer Design Studios, electives and Co-operative placements in French.

The goals for the MSoA new Strategic Plan (2023-28) are essentially to reaffirm our areas of focus and strengthen them, acknowledging that we were still very much a developing Program. Thus, the measures of success for each Strategic Plan goal will be assessed by the number of initiatives that have been undertaken that further our progress in each area. It is planned that every five years these goals will be assessed in more detail and re-calibrated as needed. For the purposes of this report, surveys have been undertaken to offer a sense of our progress to date. These, as well as summaries of our progress, are included in Section 3.1, Program Self-Assessment.

While the above outlines the MSoA Strat Plans (2023-2028, 2018-22) and the LU Strat Plan (2018-23), the first five years of the MSoA developed under the previous LU Strat Plan (2012-17). The objective that related directly to the new School of Architecture in the previous Strat Plan was No. 4: COMMUNITY RESPONSIVENESS. Under this Objective, the LU Strategic Plan text read:

"Laurentian University was founded to serve resource based and rural regions. Fresh water surrounds us in Greater Sudbury and Barrie and is a key element in the Laurentian identity with our focus on
"Clean Water Now and Forever" and on healthy communities through professional health programs,
including the Northern Ontario School of Medicine. Laurentian University is vital to the socio-economic and creative life of the communities in which we live, learn, and work.

We feel that we have achieved a unique (i.e. cutting-edge) curriculum since the School's inception. What makes our curriculum unique in Canada is its tri-cultural mix of students and faculty, beginning with our first year. As well, the incorporation of Elders-in-residence, focused courses in wood design, a unique Co-op Program in industry as well as in design related fields, and the continuous focus on Indigenous architecture and knowledge all contribute to an architectural education that studies the local (Sudbury and environs) as well as the global (First Nations, Scandinavia, Germany).

For example, Dr. Tammy Gaber's student ice hut project was recognized with an Honourable Mention at the "International VELUX Awards 2014" ceremony in Vienna in the fall of 2014. Students have had the opportunity to join faculty members on structured travel-study trips to Bergen, Norway (where they won First Prize at the Bergen International Wood Festival in 2016) and Dinkelsbühl, Germany, which contribute towards becoming part of a global "Northern" network in design and architecture. Within its first seven years, the MSoA has been actively engaged in "Community Responsiveness" by being ever present in the downtown community through festivals and our own Nuit Blanche each January as well as partnering with community groups including: Rotary Park, Dynamic Earth, Wahnapitae First Nation (WFN), Riversedge Developments (Mill Square) in Sault Sainte Marie, Powassan and District Union Public Library, Henvey Inlet FN, Chapleau's Maison Boreal, Sudbury Arena, Batchewana FN, and the Walking With Our Sisters Memorial Exhibit. All of this is consistent with the mandate of the McEwen School of Architecture to educate students from the North, particularly Northern Ontario, as well as to partner with local groups in order to respond to a variety of community needs.
In addition to this, many of graduate students' thesis research have garnered national recognition including: Raechel Hamilton (MArch 2022) and Brett Walter (MArch 2023) both won the national competition for the RAIC Foundation's Vince Catalli Scholarship for Sustainable Architectural Innovation, and Tristan O'Gorman (MArch 2022) received an Honourable Mention in the national competition held by the RAIC Foundation for the Canada Green Building Council Scholarship for Sustainable Design and Research.

Other ways in which the Program's strategic goals developed in accordance with institutional norms include making presentations on the new Program to the LUNEC (LU Native Education Council); presenting BAS and MArch courses for approval to CELP (Council for English Language Programs) and CPF (Conseil des Programmes en Français) for French courses; presenting our MArch Graduate Program to the ACAPLAN (internal to LU) and then following the extensive IQAP (Institutional Quality Assurance Program) process with the VP Academic and Provost in concert with the Ministry of Education for all new graduate programs.

Our Graduate Program was approved on the 6th of March 2017 (see Appendix B) for inception beginning in September 2018. Each of these steps in the process of Program development inquired as to how we were responding to the LU Strat Plan Objectives and Outcomes, so we were very much held accountable to institutional norms.
Finally, bullet Number 15 in the current LU Strat Plan (2018-23), under "Teaching and Learning Define Us," states a clear goal of assuring resources for accredited programs that grew out of the larger University consultation that we were part of: "We will demonstrate support for our vibrant high-quality accredited programs by providing the appropriate resources to meet external accreditation requirements."

In order to measure the success, and the timeline for executing MSoA's aspirational goals in the Program Action Plan, the members of the MSoA School Council (all full time faculty, representatives of the Sessional Faculty, Staff members and Student representative) reflect on the items depending on the goal - some are reported on periodically in the monthly Schoo ***Council meetings, other items will be evaluated once a year at the spring retreat held at the end of every academic year.***

Appendix B: The Visiting Team *(names & contact information)*

MEMBERS OF THE VISITING TEAM

VOTING MEMBERS

Olivier Vallerand — Educator — CHAIR
École de design, Faculté d'aménagem
Université de Montréal
2940, chemin de la Côte-Sainte-Catherine
Montréal, QC H3T 1B9
Tel: (514) 529-5667
Email : Olivier.vallerand@umontreal.ca

Brent Stewart — Practitioner
Goguen Architecture
212 Queen St Suite 310
Fredericton, NB E3B 1A8
Cell: (506) 458-8220
Email: brents@goguenarch.com

Marie-Paul MacDonald — Educator
School of Architecture
University of Waterloo
7 Melville Street, Cambridge, Ontario Canada
N1R 5V5
Cell: (519) 885-1211
Email: mpmacdonald@uwaterloo.ca

Patrick Benjamin Kuszyk — Practitioner
198 Yale Avenue
Winnipeg, Manitoba,
R3M 0L8
Cell: (204) 803-1833
Email: pkuzyk@mymts.net

Larissa Korol — Student
Mind Body Environment Lab
Dalhousie University
Halifax, NS, B3K 1L1
Woodbridge, ON L4H 3C9
Cell : (403) 805-7610
Email : larissa.korol@gmail.ca

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

George Cotaras — Practitioner
FBM
1950 Preston Street
Halifax, NS B3H 3V9
Cell : (902) 495-8826
Email : cotaras@fbm.ca

Kemal Alladin — Intern
J.L. Richards & Associates Limited
314 Countryside Dr, Greater Sudbury
ON P3E 6G2
Kemal.alladin@gmail.com

OBSERVERS

Terri Fuglem
Associate Professor
406 Architecture 2 Building
56 Curry Place
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba R3T 2M6
Cell: (204) 474 6855
Email: terri.fuglem@umanitoba.ca

Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL CERTIFICATION BOARD
CONSEIL CANADIEN DE CERTIFICATION EN ARCHITECTURE

1 rue Nicholas Street, Suite 710
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 7B7
613-241-8399
www.cacb-ccca.ca

Hybrid Visit Agenda Calendar

Laurentian University: Site Visit: March 01-05, 2024

This Agenda gives a framework for ordering the visit in a timely manner. The order of these items may vary, and additional items may be scheduled at the discretion of the Team Chair.

Virtual Pre-Visit Planning

50 days in advance **Student Work access** Jan. 11th, 2024	☐ The Program sends the CACB any links required to access the student work exhibit ☐ The Team Chair and CACB test the links before sharing them with the Visiting Team
Meeting #1 January 18 - 19, 2024 **45** days in advance **Readiness for the visit**	☐ The Team Chair and Program Head determine whether the program is ready for the visit ☐ The Program Head performs a walk-through of the student work compilation for the Visiting Team
Meeting #2 January 21-23, 2024 **38-40** days in advance **Process and technology overview**	☐ The Team Chair reviews student work with the Visiting Team ☐ The Team Chair provides expectations for how the team will work, and makes review assignments
Meeting #3 January 31st - February 02nd, 2024 **28-30** days in advance **Review and discussions**	☐ The Visiting Team review ACR-A (APR), CACB Conditions and Procedures, and visit protocols, and identify missing materials ☐ The Team members discuss their initial reactions to the ACR-A (APR) and student work, raise any initial concerns, and identify and prioritize the questions to be addressed during the documentary review
Meeting #4 February 16th, 2024 **14** days in advance **Documentary Review and questions**	☐ The Visiting Team reviews the results of the documentary review, finalizes questions to be addressed during the site visit, and identifies any other areas of inquiry ☐ The Team develops a draft ACR-B (VTR) ☐ Entrance meeting with Librarian

CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL CERTIFICATION BOARD
CONSEIL CANADIEN DE CERTIFICATION EN ARCHITECTURE

1 rue Nicholas Street, Suite 710
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 7B7
613-241-8399
www.cacb-ccca.ca

The Visit

Thursday (Virtual)		☐ Team Deliberations and Launch of draft ACR-B
Friday, March 1, 2024 (Virtual)	**AM**	☐ **8 am to 9 am** – MSoA Director, Undergraduate and Graduate Coordinators ☐ **9 am to 10 am** - President and Provost ☐ **10 am to 11 am** - Associate VP Students, Registrar, and Secretary of Senate ☐ **11 am to 12 pm** - Dean of SEA
	PM	☐ Team Review of general studies, electives, related programs, exhibits and records ☐ Continued Team Deliberations and drafts of ACR-B (VTR)
Saturday, March 2, 2024		☐ Day off (or Travel)
Sunday, March 3, 2024 (On-Site)	**AM**	☐ The Visiting Team's arrival and check-in at the hotel
	PM	☐ **2 pm to 2:30 pm** - Intro meeting with MSoA Director (MSoA Boardroom) ☐ **2:30 pm to 4 pm** – MSoA Director gives Team tour of facilities ☐ Visiting Team-only: Dinner and Debriefing session and continued development of draft ACR-B (VTR)
Monday, March 4, 2024 (On-Site)	**AM**	☐ **8 am to 9 am** – Team breakfast with MSoA Director (MSoA Boardroom? Details TBD) ☐ **9 am to 10 am** – Meeting with MSoA Full-Time Faculty (MSoA Boardroom) ☐ **10 am to 11:30 am** – Observation of studios: ARCH 4515 Integrated Design Studio (9:30 am to 1 pm) 4th year studio, 2nd Floor ☐ **11:30 am to 12:45 pm** – Lunch with Student Representatives (MSoA Boardroom? Details TBD)
	PM	☐ **1 pm to 2 pm** – Meeting with MSoA Students (MSoA CLT Classroom) ☐ **2 pm to 3 pm** – Observation of lectures and seminars: ARCH 1007 Sacred Places (2 to 5 pm) in the MSoA Lecture Hall ☐ Visiting Team-only: Dinner and Debriefing session, re-draft of ACR-B (VTR) and draft of Strengths and Causes of Concern
Tuesday, March 5, 2024 (On-Site)	**AM**	☐ **8 am to 9 am** - Team breakfast with MSoA Director (MSoA Boardroom? Details TBD) ☐ **9 am to 10 am** – Meeting with MSoA Staff (MSoA Boardroom) ☐ **10 am to 11 am** – Follow-up meetings with MSoA Director, Faculty, Staff and/or Students, as needed (MSoA Boardroom) ☐ Team Deliberations ☐ Team-only lunch, Final deliberations and vote
	PM	☐ **12:30 pm to 1 pm** - President and Provost (MSoA Boardroom) ☐ **1 pm to 1:30 pm** - Dean of SEA (MSoA Boardroom) ☐ **1:30 pm to 2 pm** – MSoA Director, Undergraduate and Graduate Coordinators (MSoA Boardroom) ☐ Team-only coffee/cocktails reception/dinner; check-out from Hotel and Travel

V. Report Signatures

DocuSigned by:
FC0DC879F5B541B...
Olivier Vallerand,Chair
representing the educators

DocuSigned by:
Brent Stewart
31D466C1834345...
Brent Stewart
representing the practitioners

DocuSigned by:
Marie-Paule Macdonald
F1E5227A4A8A45D...
Marie-Paul MacDonald
representing the educators

DocuSigned by:
Patrick Benjamin Kuzyk
45587D47223D43C...
Patrick Benjamin Kuzyk
representing the practitioners

DocuSigned by:
Larissa Korol
3237117 3D12A42E...
Larissa Korol
representing the students

DocuSigned by:
FB3EB5BB1CE4A4...
George Cotaras
CACB non-voting member

DocuSigned by:
kemal Alladin
0AE427A22198408...
Kemal Alladin
School non-voting member

This page is intentionally left blank