CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL CERTIFICATION BOARD

CONSEIL CANADIEN DE CERTIFICATION EN ARCHITECTURE

2024 Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture Program. M. Arch.

Institution: University of Calgary

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 9
5. Causes of Concern and Team's recommendations 10

III. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation 13

IV. Appendices 27

Appendix A: Program Information 27
Appendix B: The Visiting Team (names & contact information) 32
Appendix C: The Visit Agenda 33

V. Report Signatures 34

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 members of the 2024 CACB Visiting Team to The Program in Architecture at the University of Calgary express their collective gratitude to the faculty, staff, and students in the Program for their generous hospitality, their preparation and their responses to our questions and requests for information. We are particularly grateful to Prof. Jason Johnson for his organization of meetings and his prompt responses to our requests for additional information.

The Team acknowledges that the timing of the visit coincides with a transformational moment in the history of the School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape at the University of Calgary. The inauguration of a large undergraduate program in City Building and Design Innovation (CBDI) will change the nature of an academic unit that has, for most of its history, been entirely graduate. The relocation of the School to the downtown core presents challenges to all interested parties, within the School, the University and beyond; in particular, the students. It also represents an opportunity to create a School completely embedded in the urban core dedicated to collaboration, internal and external, in teaching, research, design, community outreach, and problem solving. It is the firm opinion of the Visiting Team that the current transformation of the School and the Program in Architecture has the potential to position it as a leader in design education.
We applaud the strength and vision of the leaders and encourage them to continue to fulfill the ambitions that were articulated to us.

This is not to say that this transformation is without difficulties. The Visiting Team recognizes the sacrifices that have been made, especially related to the rather abrupt relocation to a temporary downtown facility that lacks the necessary facilities and general amenity that would be expected in a university program in Architecture. We applaud the dedication and resilience of the faculty, staff and students who have had to carry substantial additional burdens on top of the normal demands of their roles in the Architecture Program.

We thank all those who organized, hosted and participated in conversations. We are grateful for their candor and dedication to the Program and the School.

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)

Notwithstanding that the Conditions for Accreditation have changed since the last visit, SPC B2 Program Preparation (now A4 Program Analysis), and SPC B12 Building Economics and Cost Control (now E5 Project Management) which were 'Not Met' in 2017, are now 'Met', as of the 2024 Visit.

The 2017 Visiting Team Report listed six (6) "Causes for Concern", noted below, together with the progress made (or not) within the current Program:

1. Program Identity and the intellectual commitment to the education of an architect. With the move downtown comes a clear definition of purpose to engage the community with a commitment to the ecology and sustainability of the city.

2. No progress has been made with respect to Ecology and the absence of linkage to the entire Program. SPC B5- Ecology, in the 2024 VTR, is 'Not Met'.

3. Sustainability and the need expand its current definition and application: while the current PPC 3 - Global Perspectives and Environmental Stewardship, is met, the team commented that "...while environmental and technological solutions are well-covered, the three other pillars of sustainability - social, cultural and economic - seem superficially so." The Program must strive to understand sustainability in the broadest context.

4. Interdisciplinary Learning continues to challenge SAPL. The Architecture Program is urged to strengthen its internal relationship with the Schools of Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning. At the same time, pathways to collaboration with allied disciplines (especially Engineering) should be explored in light of the move downtown and the dislocation from the main campus.

5. The Program appears to be positioning Digital Literacy within a broader understanding of design, as seen in SPC D1- Comprehensive Design.

6. The lack of Visibility as an architecture school within the University has been addressed by the move to the downtown campus and the ideological and strategic commitment of SAPL to 'optimize' the benefits of the new location, both theoretically and pedagogically.

The program has undertaken the task of reinventing itself. This trajectory is accompanied by new concerns due to many factors including speed of implementation, funding commitment to a permanent downtown campus, and the split from the main campus. These create a profound uncertainty for the Program, the students, faculty and staff. This concern must be set against the obvious commitment of everyone at SAPL to make this redefinition a success.

4. Program Strengths

The ambitious vision for the future of the School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape is clearly a strength of the Program. The Visiting Team heard testimony from the leadership of the University and the School indicating that there is a confluence of interest. The School sees itself becoming a centre for research and design thoroughly embedded in the urban environment. The University sees the downtown location as a “Beacon” for the entire institution in the city showing a commitment to the future of Calgary and overcoming the sense of isolation between the two.

The development of the new facilities for the School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape presents a rare opportunity for collaboration in design, creating a facility that is open to the community and an educational environment that intrinsically recognizes the wider context in environmental, social, economic and heritage terms.

Innovation in teaching, especially in Design Studio is a strength of the Architecture Program at the University of Calgary. The Work Integrated Learning Studio presents a novel way to connect students to practice, to provide professional experience and to connect the Program to the design professions. Considerable thought was given to the options to provide a variety of work situations and learning opportunities suited to the students.

In the second half of their final year students choose a research-based studio that introduces them to opportunities for evidence-based design and research-driven design process. These are recent and admirable innovations in design teaching. Despite some challenges, they are both worth pursuing, especially as the Program becomes more embedded in the city.

The much longer-standing tradition of Block Week courses has been reinvigorated recently. It brings external designers, architects, academics, and others to the Program to teach an intensive one-week workshop. It is clear, based on the evidence presented and the student responses to the opportunities with which they have been provided, that this is an effective mechanism to inject breadth and energy into the curriculum.

The Program is committed to teaching and conducting research related to digital design and fabrication.

The Admissions process for the M. Arch is detailed, rigorous and effective.
The Architecture Librarian is clearly dedicated to the needs of the Program. The Canadian Architectural Archive is a remarkable resource that serves researchers on Canadian architecture globally. This said, there was little evidence that the Program takes advantage of the collection.

The expansion and renewal of the faculty complement is a current strength of the Program, in particular the quality and commitment of the new members. It is notable that the Program maintains an excellent connection to local architectural firms and culture through the recruitment of junior faculty and sessional instructors.

The administrative and technical support staff members are unified and deeply committed to each other, the program and the students.
The student body has collectively dealt with the relocation to facilities that are currently inadequate, showing resilience and dedication to the Program and its educational goals, continuing to produce quality work and a strong community.

5. Causes of Concern and Team's recommendations

The quality of the temporary accommodation of the Architecture Program is a very serious concern. While the Visiting Team acknowledges that the Program has taken steps to upgrade the downtown facility and compensate for the off-campus location there is still concern that the overall quality of the space and the lack of some facilities available to Architecture students are unacceptable, specifically on grounds of basic function, acoustics, daylight, cleanliness, support facilities and student health & safety. The relocation and shortage of lead time has created a situation in which the students are dealing with conditions that are lacking and not close to normal expectations in a university context.

As mentioned, efforts have been made to ameliorate the situation, but serious upgrades in basic layout, systems, and servicing are still required.

In addition, the fact that students are forced to rely on facilities on the main campus, especially the Workshop, is a serious deprivation and a legitimate cause of concern and student discontent.
It is intended that the programs in Urban Planning and Landscape Architecture relocate to the same downtown facility in the fall of 2024. Given the way the original move played out and the short lead time for this next stage, there is great concern that the facilities will not be in a suitable state to accommodate three professional graduate programs. While the program has done well to adapt to the situation this far, the relocation must be better planned and communicated to the students and staff so as to improve the experience during the transition.

While the members of the Visiting Team applaud the vision of the future of the School and the Architecture Program shared with us, at this time, considerable uncertainty remains regarding the final location in downtown Calgary by the fall of 2025. The University has embarked on a selection process for the final site of the School. While there are two sites still in consideration, there is no assurance of a favourable outcome. This situation is clearly a cause for concern.

The Program meets the Breadth of Education requirement through its admission process, but the singular focus on architecture misses out on opportunities for comparative study and external reference points for design professionals in the arts and sciences. Both could be explored, even in a single course.

While the Visiting Team recognizes the advantage of having several perspectives represented in multiple sections of a Design Studio course, inconsistencies were observed in the outcomes of student work between sections. Greater care must be taken to ensure that all sections provide students the opportunity to meet required SPCs and that student learning is consistent.

The stated aspiration of the Architecture Program to be a full participant in the building of the city through community engagement and embracing the principles of sustainability is not being translated in the Design Studios. Urban Design and the study of larger social, economic and heritage contexts is not evident in the studio work presented. The fixation seems largely to be on the design of individual buildings.

While the Work Integrated Studio offers novel opportunities for students to become familiar with professional practice in situ, the Visiting Team registered some concern over issues of intellectual property for all partners involved in the agreements in the context of the course.
The fact that students gain very little exposure to architectural history before the 19th Century and outside North America and Europe is a concern.
In a well-attended meeting with the student body, the Visiting Team heard concerns voiced about the accommodation and lack of facilities, but concerns were also raised about inconsistencies in content, approach, deliverables, and evaluation between sections of the same Design Studio course. The Program needs to address this apprehended lack of consistency, coordination, and oversight.

Students expressed the view that their concerns are not being taken seriously. Students have remained flexible and optimistic in the face of challenges, but the Program would benefit from clearer processes for collaborative engagement with the student body.

The expansion of the faculty complement and, particularly, the recruitment of young practitioners to teaching appointments raises a concern that the School must provide adequate guidance and mentorship for recent appointees as they move forward to consideration for tenure.

The gender ratio of the faculty is dissonant to that observed in the student body. This imbalance should be corrected in the next rounds of hiring.

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 has undertaken significant changes in the past few years, especially in moving classes and studios into a temporary facility in the downtown. This significant move is meant to consolidate its mission and contribute to SAPL's ambitious strategic plan focused on sustainability, community engagement, and applied research, especially once the sister graduate programs in Landscape and Planning at the School join the Architecture Program in the coming months. The Program provides evidence of periodic consultation with alumni and students with an aim to improve curriculum, student wellbeing, equipment, and space facilities.
Despite the significant challenges the transition to the downtown location presents, the Program is making progress in its action plan.

As further evidence of self-assessment, faculty and administrative staff regularly partake in retreats, action committees, and course evaluations. SAPL developed a comprehensive strategic plan (2022-27) adopted in 2023, which, it appears, is being followed. In addition, the Program follows University of Calgary's own Strategic Plan (2023-2030), as well as it's 2019, Comprehensive Institutional Plan.

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** ☐

Pertinent information, including past accreditation reports and the required CACB text for the process of accreditation, can be found on SAPL's web page but do not appear on the University's Graduate Studies M. Arch description page. It is noted that the program should place the required text in quotations and cite it appropriately.

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** ☐

The Program follows the University's EDI policies and guidelines, which are well established, well documented and distributed throughout. The Program recognizes that there has been a long-term challenge in achieving a diverse compliment of permanent staff and faculty. The Program is trying to meet some aspects of this requirement through the hiring of sessional staff and lecturers. It is

encouraging that the Program has recently hired an EDI Director, who is a member of SAPL's leadership team.

The Program has a diverse array of opportunities for students to learn about and engage with existing as well as emergent topics of accessibility, universality, cultural approaches to habitation and housing, social justice and immigration through coursework, lectures, readings and field trips. This said, it was broadly noted by students that recent courses related to Indigenous issues seemed hastily assembled and disorganized, with limited learning outcomes.

The Program is encouraged to broaden and deepen their efforts such that it permeates all levels of the School.

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** ☐

Student composition is well documented with statistics regarding previous degrees and the origin countries of applicants and admitted students.
Block weeks remain a longstanding strength of the program and continue to allow the Program to remain nimble in its ability to address contemporary concerns of the profession.

Work-Integrated Learning provides a novel opportunity for the enrichment of education. The Program recognizes this potential as well as the difficulties of the continual development of the Work-Integrated learning course. However, the students and community/professional partners would benefit from the development of clearer guidelines and enforcement to protect mutual interests (i.e. intellectual property and rights of use) of the school, students, and community/professional partners.

There is a perception on the part of many of the students' that their concerns are not taken seriously. Students have remained flexible in the face of challenges of their education and remain committed and optimistic. The Program would benefit from greater investment in collaborative engagement..

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 faculty complement is healthy, growing and renewing. New positions are tied to the BCDI Program. Several long serving faculty members have been replaced. The Program is fortunate in having a cohort of young, qualified, energetic and dedicated scholars, teachers and designers.
The role differentiation among these new appointees makes it especially important that the leadership take strong mentorship initiatives. There is clear anxiety regarding criteria for promotion and tenure on the part of junior faculty.

The Architecture Program relies heavily on part-time faculty drawn from local design firms. This is healthy and very much in line with the overarching goal of engagement with the broader community. This is also a way in which students maintain a healthy understanding of the nature of professional practice.

On the other hand, the division of each Studio into sections and the heavy reliance on Sessional appointees carries an obligation to provide adequate review and oversight. The team heard concerns about the lack of oversight and inconsistencies between different sections in the same Studio.

It must also be acknowledged that the disparity between the gender balance in the student body and the faculty complement is an area of significant concern. Steps must be taken to address the imbalance.

On the staff side it is clear that the School has a robust, close knit and dedicated support staff who have the interests of the whole School community at heart. A careful reconsideration of the staff complement and job descriptions will be required as part of the planning process associated with the move of the entire School to a downtown site.

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 current configuration of technology resources and physical space accommodating SAPL, both at the PF Building and at the CBDL, is adequate. This said, there are a number of issues. The two buildings are divided by a commute of 30 minutes using public transportation. For those using automobiles, parking downtown is tricky. Further, the CBDL space is based on a temporary lease with the City of Calgary, but managed and maintained by a third party.

This results in a complex and attenuated process to make any repairs or improvements to the facility. The Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning programs are also scheduled to relocate to the CBDL in the Fall of 2024. Then, one year later in the Fall of 2025, the entire School, including new undergraduate program, is tentatively scheduled to relocate again to a location in the downtown core that is yet to be selected, negotiated, designed, permitted and renovated, not to mention funded. These timelines appear extraordinarily optimistic. Above all precautions must be taken to guarantee the quality of space and facilities at each step of the move downtown.

While it had been anticipated for some years, the actual move of the Program to CBDL appears to have been rushed over a few months and, even now, significant operational, functional, acoustic, and environmental control deficiencies remain, together with safety concerns at the CBDL campus. The CBDL is definitely sub-optimal.

In addition, the physical separation of critical functions of SAPL from the main campus hampers staff and student involvement with the University (workshops, student services, counselling as well as

physical and mental health supports, etc.). Though the students have been making do in the present circumstances a great deal of frustration exists. The Program has reached out to students and staff with respect to soliciting input and feedback on programmatic requirements for the anticipated permanent facility. The ongoing development of the Program requires sustained engagement from the whole school community. Significant uncertainty about the project persists among the students and staff, not to mention risk to the Program if the planned moves do not occur as envisioned.

These issues must be addressed by the Program.

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 information resources available to students in the Architecture Program are adequate and include certain points of strength and value, in particular the Canadian Architectural Archive. The Architecture Librarian is a fully engaged professional who clearly serves the needs of the students and faculty in the Architecture Program. The present location of the Architecture Program in the downtown facility presents an obvious challenge in accessing physical material in the main campus library, but the policy and practice of acquiring new materials in digital formats is a mitigating factor. That said, the role and location of information resources in the temporary and permanent downtown facilities needs to be considered carefully.

8. Financial Resources

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

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

The financial resources provided to the Program are adequate to fund the operation. The creation of the new undergraduate BCDI increases the size and diversity of a Unit that has been, historically, all, or nearly all, graduate. The financial impact, income and expense, should benefit the School overall. Though the overall budget situation is healthy, it cannot be ignored that the move to temporary facilities was seriously underfunded. The relocation was hasty and ad hoc. The students, faculty and staff have had to deal with inadequate provisions due to lack of lead time and financial investment.

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** ☐

The place of the School in the governance structure of the University, though complicated, is present and strong as evidenced by a clear understanding and support of SAPL from the Provost's office. The Program has a seat on the Council of Faculties which is the governing body responsible for all

academic- related undertakings. The administrative staff meeting revealed a close-knit team who were each aware of the challenges and responsibilities of the other. The success of this 'non-departmentalized' approach results in an administrative group operating beyond silos.

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 Program requires an undergraduate degree for admission and more than three years of professional study to obtain the Master of Architecture degree.

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** ☐
Learning outcomes for this PPC are met in ARCH 604, ARCH 618 and ARCH 700. The school's stated desire to 'critically transform the nature of the professional in society' is clear in these courses. At the student meeting, there was a consistent and positive reaction to the access that the downtown location gave to the offices of practicing architects and engineers. At the same meeting, students acknowledged the place of the CACB and Accreditation. It is recommended that more direct interaction with the regulating and advocacy bodies (AAA & CAA) would enrich the critical enquiry of the Program on this topic.

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** ☐
Design is the central focus of the curriculum. Design studios are coordinated with the content of academic courses in a productive and supportive manner. Work-Integrated Learning options in the final year of the Program give students a taste of practice in situ. Block week courses enrich the Design curriculum, as do lecture series and other events, exposing students to social debates, technical advances, and diverse professional practices. Research labs invite students to experiment with different aspects of design education and explore knowledge-based design.

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** ☐
While the alumni survey shows low scores for EDIA and sustainable design, the program has taken concrete steps to address this concern in appointing a Director of EDIA and in developing a new core course in Sustainability and the Built Environment, ARCH 500. However, the Visiting Team notes that, while environmental and technological aspects of sustainability are well-covered, the three other pillars - social, cultural and economic - seem superficially so. The study abroad studios allow many students exposure to cultures other than their own. The History and Theory courses and some design studio sections expose students to Indigenous world views, although cultures from around the world are less represented in the curriculum.

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** ☐

Evidence of collaboration is found in ARCH 618 and the courses on proposal writing where team makeup, including external consultants, is considered. Education in collaboration, together with leadership is well documented in ARCH 604. It is self-evident in the studio process that leadership and collaboration occurs in group projects and in working with allied disciplines. Evidence of community engagement is less clear in the studio sequence. Block weeks, community events held at CBDL, ARCH 680, and Work Integrated Learning studios all provide evidence of community engagement in various forms. There is little indication of any collaboration with the Programs and Landscape Architecture and Urban Planning within SAPL.

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** ☐

The Program's intentional progression of establishing a theoretical foundation, and later utilizing this as a fulcrum to apply creative solutions as part of a coordinated design, is clear. This arrangement and flow of design studios and technical courses provides students with a rare opportunity: to freely experiment and test new assemblies and differing conditions - without the constraints of real-world clients, budgets, schedules, and deliverables to douse the flames of creativity. This condition creates a tension in the work of Comprehensive Design at the M1 level, where highly complex forms and spatial arrangements are teetering between being plausibly constructible and not; sustainably coherent and not. The program is encouraged to consider enhancing the learning outcomes by reminding students of the investigative work done in ARCH 606 and redeploying it with the notion of "craft as artifact", as a method of critical investigation, to bookend the studio sequence.

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** ☐

Evidence is partly found in the studios, lectures, the History and Theory stream, the Technical stream, within Block Week courses, and other electives. These courses directly relate to different perspectives of architecture, and therefore to a "deeper study of topics within the discipline of architecture". However, perspectives different from architecture "in the pursuit of a broad understanding of human knowledge" are not offered by the Program. This aspect of the condition is met by the admission requirements, and the educational backgrounds of students. It is recommended that the singular architectural lens of the entire program be reviewed to allow more comparative study, including collaboration with other professional programs within the school.

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 for students' ability to critically analyze architecture precedents is present in the concomitant delivery of ARCH 504 and ARCH 506.
However, it is less visible in subsequent studio courses. Evidence of students' ability to "articulate a design process grounded in theory and practice" is most notable in the delivery of ARCH 512 and ARCH 514 in tandem with ARCH 606 and ARCH 602.

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 can be found in the required design studio sequence. One caveat: the application of precedent analysis is unconvincing or absent in most of the student work provided. However, faculty assured the Visiting Team that it was done consistently in the design process, even if these analyses were omitted from student portfolios or panels.

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 ample evidence of compliance with this criterion in ARCH 502 and 512 as well as the required design studio sequence.

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** ☐
The evidence is clear from all sections of ARCH 616 that students are capable of analyzing and responding to a complex building program. None of the projects put in evidence actually addressed equipment or relevant laws.

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** ☑

Evidence provided from ARCH 500 shows that students are able to analyze physical site conditions. In student work from design studio courses, analysis focuses especially on physical aspects such as circulation and solar position. Analysis of other site conditions along with larger cultural, economic, historical, social, and ecological contexts is inconsistent, missing, or ignored. There is little evidence showing how a project directly responds to local site character.

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 Visiting Team found little evidence of student work addressing large scale design decisions around development of urban fabric, building density, typologies and urban form. Studio projects quickly center on the architectural scale and propose a formal object that largely ignores integration into existing morphologies, environmental or ecological systems. Consideration of regulatory contexts is unclear from work presented. The lack of such considerations in Design Studios is not consistent with the stated ambitions of the School in moving to a downtown site and deeply engaging the challenges of City Building.

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** ☐

Satisfactory of compliance was found in ARCH 616.

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** ☐

ARCH 616, ARCH 504 and ARCH 512 show evidence that students are able to document and present the outcome of a design process, with the exception of specifications.

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** ☐

Students are supported in developing critical response to architecture in personal and academic forms and language in ARCH 502, ARCH 510, and ARCH 602. Critical thought is clearly applied in design studios and the graphics courses.

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 sequence of two history courses meets this criterion. The skills in writing and research cultivated in these courses are excellent. Students are given freedom to choose the subjects of their research and writing which fosters personal intellectual engagement. The choice to begin the range of material covered in the 19th century was explained as response to the limited time available and the desire to pursue depth. While the Visiting Team can accept this position, it must register a concern that the depth of the history of our field both geographically and temporally seems to have been lost.

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** ☐

This criterion is met in ARCH 602 and ARCH 675. Students receive a contemporary and vivid introduction to architecture that is explored against a background of social and cultural theory.

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 provided in ARCH 502, ARCH 610, and ARCH 602 demonstrates that students can understand the broad set of perspectives described in this criterion. ARCH 604 meets the requirements related to societal roles and responsibilities of architects. The combination of

the above courses meets the requirements of this SPC. It was observed that the diversity of the student body and potential exposure to other cultures in ARCH 688 supplements the ability of the program to meet the SPC, but not consistently across the entire student body.

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 evidence provided is insufficient to demonstrate that all students are able to meet this SPC. The work produced in ARCH 675 suggests that some students may demonstrate an understanding of broader ecologies, however, there is no evidence outside of this half credit course. Students do not demonstrate in any other course an understanding of ecology beyond the envelope of the buildings they design.

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** ☑

While there appears to be an awareness of the regulatory issues related to building code, regulations and standards of design in ARCH 612 and ARCH 616, they do not demonstrate an understanding of universal design or what factors and influences need to be investigated to appropriately select and apply life-safety systems.

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** ☐

This SPC is fulfilled primarily through coursework in ARCH 508 and further evidence in the studio work of ARCH 606, ARCH 616 and ARCH 612. ARCH 508 develops a “first principles” understanding of constructability and sequencing of assemblies and systems. The program is encouraged to deeply embed life-cycle renewal not only in the evaluation and selection of materials and assemblies, but also consider the concept of long-term maintenance as a key component of sustainable design.

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** ☐

The program has improved this aspect of technical knowledge since the last accreditation visit. ARCH 600 and ARCH 610 contain assignments that are very good examples of didactically bridging theoretical design concepts into applied solutions.

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** ☐
ARCH 612 and ARCH 616 contain large scale details showing the components of building envelopes where there is evidence of students understanding the conceptual requirements required to meet this SPC. The Program is encouraged to aim for a deeper understanding of the scientific requirements of building envelopes (effects of pressure, temperature transfer and dew point and physics of water ingress, etc.) in relation to varieties of climates and changing climate.

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** ☑
Though ARCH 614 achieves the desired level of design resolution and understanding to satisfy a portion of this SPC, there is insufficient evidence to confirm that students are gaining an understanding of electrical and mechanical systems such as indoor air quality, heating, ventilation, plumbing, etc.

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** ☐
The work in ARCH 616, supported by ARCH 608, ARCH 610, ARCH 612, and ARCH 614, all contribute towards turning a conceptual architectural idea into a resolved building design that addresses physical site analysis, program, tectonics and building systems integration. The team noted that the Program claims to hold ecological and social sustainability as core drivers of the pedagogy, the predominantly complex formal arrangements and spaces (as well as detail solutions of the projects) seem somewhat at odds with this notion. A similar point was made in the previous VTR. The team noted that projects in ARCH 616 are completed in pairs,

which may not reflect individual student ability, that may result in inconsistencies in evaluation.

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** ☑

The course outline for ARCH 618 indicates a series of lectures and round table discussions about the profession (with daily assignments), but there is insufficient evidence provided that demonstrates students have achieved a level of *understanding* for this SPC. The program is encouraged to strengthen and enrich the outcomes of this SPC by inviting the AAA to present at the January 6 Lectures *"Forum 4a: Architectural Profession and the Architect's Act"* and *"Forum 4b: Path to Licensure and Internship."* It's noteworthy to mention the repetitive typo (there is no apostrophe in Architects Act) in the course outline and APR is one of the most profoundly fundamental misconceptions about the role of the regulator.

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** ☑

The course outline for ARCH 618 indicates a series of lectures and round table discussions about the profession (with daily assignments), there is insufficient evidence provided that demonstrate students have achieved a level of understanding the professional regulatory duties and responsibilities of the architect. ARCH 604 provides an engaging counter-discourse of advocacy for the profession. The program is encouraged to further explore the tension between regulation and advocacy, which are inherently at cross purposes to each other.

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** ☐

ARCH 604, ARCH 700 and ARCH 618 capture the requirement for business planning, entrepreneurship, marketing, and proposal writing. ARCH 680 offers rich studies in the exploration of modes of community development. The program is encouraged to examine these themes in the context of traditional and evolving project delivery methodologies, including AI.

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** ☐
Lectures and round table discussions in ARCH 618 satisfy the requirements of this SPC.

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** ☐
Notwithstanding the course outline for ARCH 618 indicates a series of lectures and round table discussions about the profession (with daily assignments), there is evidence provided that demonstrates students have achieved a level of understanding of project and risk management from a project or cost control perspective.

IV. Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

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

1- Brief History of University of Calgary

The institution that became the University of Calgary was initially established in 1945 as an extension of the University of Alberta in Edmonton. In 1966 the University of Calgary was given its new name and autonomous stature as a post-secondary institution, a result that was a long-term goal of the city and region. The establishment of the University of Calgary coincided with the city's emergence as an international business and cultural centre. The University celebrated its 50th anniversary in 2016 and is now ranked in the top universities in Canada for research funding with over $485 million. The university's mandate statement can be found at: https://ucalgary.ca/about/our-organization/our-mandate

The University has occupied its main campus site in NW Calgary since 1960, with major growth occurring between 1965 and 1976; it also has five satellite campuses. Today it is a comprehensive research and teaching university with an annual budget of over $1.3 billion, and a broad range of Faculties (including Engineering, Medicine, Nursing, Kinesiology, Veterinary Medicine, and Management), over 250 academic departments and major program areas, as well as research institutes and centres. See a brief history of the institution: https://ucalgary.ca/about/our-history/changing-face-campus

Today the University has over 32,000 full-time students, and over 1,800 faculty members actively engaged in teaching, research, and scholarship in Canada and around the world. With more than 3,200 staff the University is one of Calgary's largest employers; the institution has a substantial economic impact on the city and region. It also part of Campus Alberta, an alliance between post-secondary institutions in the province that harmonizes research and learning opportunities. See: https://ucalgary.ca/about/our-organization/facts-and-figures

The current University President and Vice-Chancellor is Dr. Ed McCauley, who is in his second term after being first appointed in 2018. In 2022-2023 the institution undertook a broad strategic planning exercise, building upon previous plans. The new plan is called "Ahead of Tomorrow, 2023-2030" and can be found at: https://ucalgary.ca/about/ahead-of-tomorrow

2- Institutional Mission

Mission Statement taken from the University of Calgary 2023-30 Strategic Plan: *Ahead of Tomorrow*

The University of Calgary powers positive change**.**
We strive for inimitable excellence through innovative teaching and learning, cutting-edge exploration, and community linkage.
We seek to surpass today's limitations, our quest a prosperous, compassionate, sustainable, and equitable world. We lead change by combining academic excellence with a spirit of innovation.
Knowledge creation and mobilization pilot our research, impelled by action and agility.
Our current and former students, postdocs, faculty, and staff, serve today while anticipating a tomorrow that we have the power to reframe.

3- Program History

The Faculty of Environmental Design (EVDS, now the School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape (SAPL)) was established in 1971 in response to a campaign by the Alberta Association of Architects for a school of architecture in the province. Its non-departmental structure housed academic programs in Architecture, Environmental Science, and Urbanism. The intention of both the University and the Association, in establishing such an academic unit, was to meet the increasing demands being placed on the profession and on the environment through the education and training of professionals for a greater variety of design roles in an academic environment that not only encouraged but required interdisciplinary group approaches to teaching and research. Prof. William T. Perks, from Ottawa's National Capital Commission, was founding Dean of the Faculty (1971-1981) and Professor R. Douglas Gillmor, FRAIC, from the University of Manitoba, the founding Director of the Architecture Program.

The early challenges facing the Program were the professional liaison and curriculum development necessary to implement the professional programs of study while at the same time developing the interdisciplinary links within the Faculty. Among the accomplishments of this period was the development of the theoretical and pedagogical foundations of the Program and the recruitment of students and faculty committed to the idea of interdisciplinary studies. In addition to Doug Gillmor, the Directorship was held in this period by James McKellar, FRAIC and Dr. Michael McMordie.

Since the last accreditation visit in 2017, several significant new initiatives have shaped the MArch program and the School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape (see above). The MArch Program has focused on improving internal processes and student satisfaction, transforming the curriculum (initiated in 2020), developing a second study abroad option in Tokyo (established in 2016), taking advantage of the downtown CBDL location, and hiring several new faculty members. Curriculum changes led to the addition a seventh term (Spring-Summer), adding more electives, and developing a Work-Integrated Learning semester. The launching of the new Doctorate of Design (DDes) degree in 2019, and the new Bachelor of Design in City Innovation (BDCI) degree in 2023 have also impacted the visibility and the reputation of the School and its programs.

The decision to establish a downtown presence for SAPL in 2019, in two floors (2,300 m2) of the former main public library building, has given SAPL a unique location adjacent to City Hall. This venue, known as the City Building Design Lab (CBDLab), is used for exhibitions, lectures/events, studios, research, and administration; securing the facility was generously supported by the Calgary Municipal Land Corporation and the City of Calgary. In 2023, as a result of the start of the new Bachelor of Design in City Innovation (BDCI) undergraduate degree program, the MArch Program has relocated all of its students to the CBDLab, and an additional floor (1,150 m2) has been acquired. The situation is temporary until a new location is secured and renovated in the downtown core.

The CBDLab has greatly enhanced the visibility of the School particularly as it engages in a host of partnerships in Calgary. It has also allowed the School to expand its role as a centre for innovative design dialogues, where practitioners, scholars, citizens, politicians, and business people can share ideas. The facility on the main campus remains a state-of-the-art one, due to continuous upgrades to spaces and equipment. The on-campus location provides excellent learning and teaching environments, and a very well-equipped and staffed workshop. The School is hoping to consolidate its facilities in one downtown location as the City of Calgary is encouraging post-secondary programs to relocate in the downtown core, and to this end has awarded the School a grant to support the relocation.

4- Program Mission

The Master of Architecture (MArch) Program in the School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape (SAPL) at the University of Calgary offers a three-year (seven semester) graduate-level curriculum leading to a professional degree in architecture. This comprises a two-year (five semester) Masters component, with an additional Foundation year (two semester) for students without an undergraduate pre-professional degree in architecture. The Program prepares individuals to be thoughtful, productive, and skilled contributors to the evolving world of architectural practice. The Program is part of a School that offers pre-professional options (ARST Minor, BDCI), professional degrees (MArch, MLA, MPlan), and post-professional degrees (MEDes, PhD, DDes).

With a total enrollment of approximately 170 students, The MArch Program provides a supportive environment for teaching, learning, and research. The Program attracts a diverse range of high calibre students from across Canada and abroad (including India, Iran, Nigeria, China, Latin America, and the United States). As the professional degree is offered at the graduate level, students are required to have a Bachelor's degree for admittance, this can be an undergraduate degree from the University of Calgary (including a Minor in Architectural Studies option), the School's new Bachelor of Design in City Innovation (BDCI) degree, an undergraduate degree from a recognized post-secondary institution, or pre-professional or professional degrees from other institutions. This means that students come from a wide range of academic backgrounds which contributes significantly to the life of the Program. Students tend to by highly qualified, mature, articulate, and often have previous work experience. There is a comprehensive program of awards, scholarships, and teaching assistantships available to support studies.

The Program and School offers a host of innovative learning opportunities and a wide range of enrichment opportunities including lectures, exhibitions, field trips, workshops, and the like. The study abroad options in Barcelona (established in the early 1990s) and Tokyo are an essential part of the Program's identity. Recent changes to the curriculum involved adding a seventh (Spring/Summer) semester to accommodate the study abroad program, and the addition of a dedicated Work Integrated Learning semester in the Fall of the final year which allows students to experience a professional work environment. The development of a full slate of elective courses and studios electives was also included in the overall changes. The Block Week courses offered three times a year provide a unique opportunity for the delivery of required and elective courses, particularly with the Somerville, Taylor, and Gillmor offerings that bring distinguished teachers and practitioners to the Program. The new Bachelor of Design in City Innovation (BDCI) is expected to attract many students interested in "global citizenship" and urbanism, and will provide a stream of students into the professional degree programs (over 600 applicants for 75 positions were received in the first year).

5- Program Action Plan

The MArch Program's strategic initiatives are discussed and developed at the Program level and then forwarded to the Dean's office; the Program action plan both harmonizes with the SAPL Strategic Plan 2022-2027 (the most recent strategic plan was adopted in 2023, see: https://sapl.ucalgary.ca/sites/default/files/teams/1/SAPL%20Strategic%20Plan%202022-2027.pdf). The SAPL Strategic Plan 2022-2027 identifies four strategic priorities: 1) Optimize Location, 2) Build BDCI, 3) Intensify Research, and 4) Enrich Programs. It also identifies four values: 1) Climate Action, 2) Social Justice, 3) Community Impact, and 4) Value-Informed Innovation. The 32 specific goals identified in the plan aligns with the action plan subsequently developed by MArch Program.

Previously, a five-year plan was adopted by the Program in 2015, with adjustments made in 2016 and after the 2017 CACB accreditation visit. In 2023 a new action plan was adopted by the Program (normal strategic planning was interrupted by the uncertainty created by the COVID pandemic). The M. Arch Program action plan (2023-2028) identifies the following priorities:

The Master of Architecture Program in the School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape (SAPL) has, over the last 10 years, undergone changes in curriculum and expanded research and teaching capacity in an ongoing effort to prepare students for a future that will require designers to deploy their knowledge and skills in a rapidly changing and increasingly unpredictable context. Over the next period of growth and development the program will strive to build upon SAPL's strategic plan and the newly launched University of Calgary strategic plan, both of which contextualize a focus on the future might demand of our students and academic institutions.

The Master of Architecture Program will continue to apply a critical lens to our future focused curriculum, our move to downtown Calgary, and our support of applied research and community engagement.

The areas of focus will continue to be developed using contemporary tools, expansion of our teaching and research capacity, and multi-disciplinary collaborations within SAPL and the University of Calgary.

1. Optimize Program Move to Downtown Calgary

a. Identify key architecture firms, civic organizations, and City of Calgary initiatives for potential partnership opportunities.

b. Expand Work-Integrated Learning opportunities and support through creation of a dedicated team of faculty and staff.

c. Develop and support applied research that engages the challenges/opportunities of downtown Calgary.

d. Capitalize on opportunities to demonstrate commitments to sustainable, inclusive, and innovative design practices to a larger audience.

2. Expand Teaching and Research Capacity through staff

SAPL is hiring a large cohort of new faculty members to support our interdisciplinary undergraduate degree in Building Design and City Innovation (BDCI). As part of this expansion the Master of Architecture Program can expect to add up to 10 new faculty members by 2024.

a. Identify key areas of the curriculum and research agendas of the program that need support through new faculty.
b. Increase diversity of faculty cohort in full and part time positions and support this process with increased attention to recruiting and retention.
c. Expand opportunities for vertically integrated teaching between the professional program and the undergraduate design degree.
d. Formalize positions that include teaching and technical research functions previously soloed in separate staffing streams.

3. **Build on Strengths in Computation, Experiential Learning, and Applied Research**
    a. Expand required development of digital skills into M1 year.
    b. Formalize block week thematic structure:
        i. Tools & Techniques
        ii. Human Behavior, Indigenous Design, Sustainable Practices, Design Justice
        iii. Energy/Material/Life Cycle Performance & Simulation
        iv. History Theory
        v. Field Studies
    c. Integrate applied research projects into curriculum where appropriate, including Work-Integrated Learning Studios, Block Weeks, Electives, and student led projects.

4. **Increase Program Visibility.**
    a. Actively promote research work to potential students, faculty, and general audiences.
    b. Host conferences, symposia, exhibitions, and events that engage local, national, and international audiences
    c. Support platforms for dissemination of design research in the faculty.
    d. Continue to engage alumni to be active participants in the promotion of the program.

5. **Evaluate Curriculum Continuously**
    a. Thematic Cluster Development
    b. Expand City Studio/Study Abroad Options
    c. Engage Profession to Identify Gaps

The action plan outlines our intentions to continue to build a program that evolves to meet the shifting challenges architects and design professionals will face in the coming decades.

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

MEMBERS OF THE VISITING TEAM

VOTING MEMBERS

Eric Haldenby — Educator — CHAIR
School of Architecture
University of Waterloo
7 Melville Street South
Cambridge, ON N1S 2H4
Cell: (519) 404-6551
Email : erhalden@uwaterloo.ca

Sean Rodrigues — Practitioner
Catholic Archdiocese of Vancouver
4885 St John Paul II Way
Vancouver, BC V5Z 0G3
Tel: (604) 219-0802
Email : srodrigues@rcav.org

Tania Martin — Educator
École d'architecture
Université Laval
Pavillon Vieux-Séminaire-de-Québec,
local 3202. Québec, QC G1V 0A6
Tel: (418) 656-2131, ext. 402052
Email : Tania.Martin@arc.ulaval.ca

Rodney Kirkwood — Practitioner
111 Dunsmuir St #1100
Vancouver, BC, V6B 6A3
Cell: (867) 446-1471
Email: Rodney.Kirkwood@stantec.com

Ron Christopher Adriano — Intern
CRAIG RACE ARCHITECTURE
282 Richmond St E
Toronto, ON M5A 1P4
Cell : (416) 893-0579
Email : ronc.adriano@gmail.com

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Baldwin Hum — Practitioner
Quadra Architecture
Vancouver, BC
Cell: (604) 343-4659
Email: bh@quadraa.com

OBSERVERS

Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

Hybrid Visit Agenda Calendar
University of Calgary, March 01-06, 2024

TEAM ROOM – Orange Room – Alt Hotel Calgary East Village
**all meeting slots are as per MT*

Friday, March 01, 2024 (Virtual)

09:00-10:00 am	Entrance meeting with Program Head – Jason S. Johnson
10:00-11:00 am	Entrance meeting with Dean – John Brown
11:00-12:00 pm	Entrance meeting with Deputy Provost – Robin Yates

Sunday, March 03, 2024

Team travels to Calgary

Monday, March 04, 2024 (In-person)

10:00-12:00 pm	Visiting team introductions and orientation (Team Room)
12:00-12:30 pm	Short intro meeting with program head (Team Room)
12:30-02:00 pm	Lunch and Entrance meeting with faculty as a group (CBDL 3rd floor faculty space)
02:15-04:00 pm	Tour of facilities (CBDL)
TBD	Team-only dinner and debriefing *(Location: TBD by CACB)*

Tuesday, March 05, 2024 (In-person)

8:00-9:00 am	Team working breakfast with Program Head (Team Room)
9:30-10:30 am	Meeting with staff (PF 3177)
10:30-11:30 am	Tour of Main Campus Facilities *(Meet with Architecture Librarian/archives TBC)*
12:00-01:00 pm	Lunch meeting with Student Reps (CBDL)
01:00-02:30 pm	Entrance meeting with Students (CBDL)
02:30-06:00 pm	Debriefing session (Team Room)
TBD	Team-only dinner *(Location: TBD by CACB)*

Wednesday, March 06, 2024 (In-person)

8:00-9:00 am	Team working breakfast with Program Head (Team Room)
9:30-11:30 am	Team Time (Team Room)
11:30-12:30 pm	Team Lunch *(TBD by CACB)*
01:00-02:00 pm	Exit meeting with Program Head – Jason S. Johnson (PF 2107, *hold is confirmed – awaiting formal invite to in-person meeting from CACB)*
02:00-03:00 pm	Exit meeting with Dean – John Brown (John's Office at PF, *hold is confirmed – awaiting formal invite to in-person meeting from CACB)*
03:00-04:00 pm	Exit meeting with Deputy Provost – Robin Yates *(Hold is confirmed – awaiting formal invite to in-person meeting from CACB)*
	Check-out of hotel and depart.

V. Report Signatures

DocuSigned by:
Eric Haldenby
84D3D06D283E46C...

Eric Haldenby

Chair

representing the educators

DocuSigned by:
Tania Martin
35628EBB44A74A7...

Tania Martin

representing the educators

DocuSigned by:
53A83B12011F4DB...

Rodney Kirkwood

representing the practitioners

DocuSigned by:
Sean Rodrigues
186F227BA779401...

Sean Rodrigues

representing the practitioners

DocuSigned by:
B1A2556509FB428...

Ron Christopher Adriano

representing the Interns

DocuSigned by:
9133D2AC49FA41C...

Baldwin Hum

CACB non-voting member

This page is intentionally left blank