CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL CERTIFICATION BOARD

CONSEIL CANADIEN DE CERTIFICATION EN ARCHITECTURE

2026 Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture Program. M.Arch

Institution: McGill 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: accreditation@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) 8
4. Program Strengths 11
5. Causes of Concern and Team's Recommendations 12

III. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation 13

IV. Appendices 27

Appendix A: Program Information 27
Appendix B: The Visiting Team (Names & Contact Information) 30
Appendix C: The Visit Agenda 31

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 Regulatory Organizations of Architecture in Canada (ROAC), 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

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.

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.

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.

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 "three-year term," the *Program* must receive at least a six-year term or its *accreditation* shall be revoked.

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 wish to commend everyone in the Program for effectively creating and consistently maintaining a collegial, supportive and inclusive environment shared by the faculty, students and the administrative staff alike.

The Visiting Team would like to thank the administrators of McGill University, Deep Saini (President and Vice-Chancellor), Angela Campbell (Provost and Executive Vice-President Academic), and Viviane Yargeau (Dean of the Faculty of Engineering), for their warm welcome and candid feedback. The team would like to also thank David Theodore (Director), the faculty and staff for the at the Peter Guo-hua Fu School of Architecture, for the quality and breadth of the visit.

The team noted the high quality orientations for the library, archive and IT support services provided by David Greene, Jennifer Garland, Tellina Liu, and Juan Osorio. Additionally, Marcia King, Athanasia Blounas, Luciana Adoyo provide students with empathetic counselling and attentive administrative assistance.

And as a final and very sincere note, my colleagues and I wish to extend a heartfelt thanks to you and the whole McGill university family for your invaluable generosity of time and forbearance throughout this extended process. And also especially for your warm and generous hospitality during our visit. We would like to again express special thanks to Director David Theodore who has meticulously planned the visit and patiently responded to each of our multiple requests.

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. Performance Criteria		
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 (SPC)		
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: Professional 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 following section reviews the Causes of Concerns identified in the Visiting Team Report from the previous accreditation visit. These concerns are presented in *italics*, and in some areas references to earlier reports where the issue has been longstanding. To keep the section organized, the Visiting Team has added subheadings to the causes of concerns, and to group these similar longstanding ones. The Program's response to these concerns are provided in the APR. Comments from the current Visiting Team follow each item.

3.a Previous Visit Cause of Concern related to Progress

The Team's concerns are framed by a key CACB Criteria for Accreditation, that is, professional programs in architecture should be making reasonable progress toward eliminating the deficiencies identified during the previous accreditation site visit.

> **2026 VTR Comment:** The team recognizes the significant work undertaken by the School to develop clear, articulated, and effective adjustments to the program, and the self-assessment exercises leading to extensive curricular development addressing deficiencies identified in previous Visiting Team Reports. In particular these developments are addressing deficiencies pertaining to Comprehensive Building Design and associated courses focused on technological literacy and capacity.

3.b Previous Visit Cause of Concern related to Curriculum

The lack of opportunity for students to take Humanities courses (2006, 2012, 2018).

> **2026 VTR Comment:** Recommendations calling for increased access to courses in the liberal arts have been addressed.

3.c Previous Visit Cause of Concerns related to Facilities

The Macdonald-Harrington Building is currently undergoing a major renovation and restoration ($15 million) of the building envelope and the professional M.Arch. studios on the fifth floor. However, interior spaces remain in need of renovation, with certain areas – including workshops, digital fabrication facilities, undergraduate studios (especially U2) and teaching spaces (Room 212) in urgent need of attention. Special attention needs to be paid to air quality in the wood shop and adjacent space housing laser cutters. The need for upgrades to the building and to IT infrastructure was cited in the 2018 and 2012 VTR, the 2011 Cyclical Academic Review, the 2006 VTR and the 2006 External Review report (2012).

The current Team restates and emphasizes the concern raised by previous CACB Visiting Teams regarding the facilities of the School of Architecture. The restoration of the building envelope

from foundation to roof, while much needed and admirable, should be accompanied by a complete restoration and renovation of the interior of the building so that spaces and facilities share the glory of the facade. The various projects for renewal of individual spaces should be amalgamated in an overall renewal plan that includes building systems, ventilation, services, the studios, lecture halls and other teaching spaces. Of particular concern are the workshop, laser cutting area and media space, which appear to be far too small and are the source of serious concern expressed by students on matters of safety and air quality. The shops require an Assembly Space so that students are not using the Studios and other inappropriate locations for such work (2018).

> **2026 VTR Comment:** Refer to the Visiting Team assessment comment under Section III. Compliance with Conditions for Accreditation, Condition 6 Space and Technology Resources.

3.d Previous Visit Cause of Concerns related to Human Resources

There is a pressing need for additional technical staff able to facilitate use of digital infrastructure and other services. The demand on this position will only grow.

Human Resources concerns of this type have been raised in the 2001 VTR, the 2006 VTR, the 2006 External Review report, and the 2011 Cyclical Academic Review, and were raised again by faculty and students during the 2012 visit. Although some progress has been made in some areas, the substantive concern of deficiencies in Human Resources has not been resolved (2012).

The shortage of technical support staff remains a significant concern requiring urgent attention. (2018).

> **2026 VTR Comment:** A second technical support staff position has been retained and assigned to the wood workshop with paid student assistants providing extended hours of operation. This concern has been addressed.

The School must take further steps to achieve greater diversity and gender equality in its complement of full-time faculty members (2018).

> **2026 VTR Comment:** The School has taken decisive measures to improve diversity and correct gender inequality. This is no longer an area of concern.

3.e Previous Visit Cause of Concern related to Administrative Responsibility

The Team notes that there is a lack of clarity in administrative responsibility for the professional MArch program. This must be addressed (2012).

2026 VTR Comment: Administrative responsibility for the MArch program has been clarified and addressed.

3.f Previous Visit Cause of Concern related to Indigenous Studies

The School should develop a clear and cohesive approach to relationships with Indigenous communities and culture (2018).

2026 VTR Comment: The School is continuing to address developing relationships with Indigenous communities and culture. Since the last VTR, the School has created entrance and in-course awards, published in 2022 *Architecture Anti-racism Working Group Report*, and retained Christopher Clarke McQueen (Chief Architect for the Government of the Northwest Territories, Ministry of Health and Social Services and PhD candidate). The Visiting Team commends this initial effort and encourages the School to continue developing a robust approach.

4. Program Strengths

The commitment to the study of history, including the rich architectural legacy of Montreal, combined with deep research, teaching in circular economies and adaptive re-use, are powerful focci for the Program, attractive to both potential students and faculty.

Despite capital funding cuts, the Program has completed an iterative series of upgrades to the finishes, power and IT in some studio spaces in the MacDonald-Harrington Building. These follow the successful restoration of the exterior skin, fenestration and roofing which, taken together, confirm a commitment to the architectural legacy of the building as a significant home for the Program.

The Visiting Team found the students are:

- Highly engaged and a tightly bonded, at both the cohort and program level;
- Afforded valuable international study abroad terms, with stipend, to affiliated universities;
- Invited to undertake both research and teaching assistant roles; and
- Provided with broad level supports for course and personal counselling, IT and technical resources.

The "DIAL" mentorship program is an impressive initiative provided to all faculty that helps them both develop professionally and navigate McGill's administrative and teaching environment.

There is a strong sense of a supportive community evident at all levels of the Program.

The high level of research expected of faculty is administratively supported by limiting faculty to deliver only four courses, with studio counting as two courses. In this regard, the Program is "walking the talk."

5. Causes of Concern and Team's Recommendations

Cause of Concern 1: Faculty and Staff Resources

Notwithstanding the Program is advertising for a new tenure-track position, replacement of retiring staff is currently on hold by the University. This significantly affects faculty positions, which have been reduced by approximately 1/3 since the previous accreditation visit in 2018. Increasing reliance on sessional course instructors is increasing pressure on tenure-track faculty for administrative and other service appointments.

Cause of Concern 2: Individual and Group Work

The evolution of team-based learning in the Program is important as it teaches students how to collaborate and mimics the workplace experience. At the same time challenges arise where some students could conceivably navigate the program without developing one or more competencies, making individual assessment difficult to discern in the context of accreditation. The program is encouraged to continue to develop an evaluation matrix which overcomes this challenge.

Cause of Concern 3: Humanities and Social Sciences Library

The faltering status of a physical library as "a resource with books on shelves" results in the inability of students and faculty to browse titles - an important aspect of architectural research and discovery. An action plan beyond the incremental return of books as they are retrieved is needed.

Cause of Concern 4: Macdonald-Harrington Building

Notwithstanding the architectural quality of the Macdonald-Harrington Building, outstanding life cycle upgrades including HVAC, Power, and IT, together with space and safety concerns in the fabrication lab remain, and need to be addressed. As this is a shared resource within the aegis Faculty of Engineering, such upgrades could benefit Architecture and Engineering students alike.

III. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

General Instructions about Commentary / Assessment

For each Condition, Program and Student Performance Criteria, the Team must write a summary of the program's responses based on material provided in the APR and information gathered during the visit. The team must verify that the program effectively responds to every sub condition. The team must identify the evidence or the source of the evidence the team used to make the assessment. Describe how the team confirmed evidence provided by the program through interactions during the site visit.

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 ☐**

Unlike processes in 2018, which were primarily reactive to VTR Assessments, the Program has undertaken retreats and has formally reached out to students and alumni in forums, for feedback. This is shown in 1.2 Program Action Plan and Objectives and 3.3, Program Self-Assessment. In addition, the University has many checks and balances with respect to equity, diversity and inclusion, identified in 3.3. The Program is encouraged to continue to assess the well-being of faculty, which was evident and affirmed in particular by new faculty during onsite meetings.

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 Regulatory Organizations of Architecture in Canada (ROAC) to accredit Canadian professional degree programs in architecture for the purposes of architectural licensure."

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

Found on the main Program website under "About/Accreditation."

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 ☐**

In addition to mandated Federal and Provincial EDI mandates, McGill and the Program have developed their own action plan to address anti-Black and wider racism, and have made two hires under this initiative. Faculty and staff compliments have increased with currently six (6) female faculty of ten (10) full time faculty.

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 support and well-being are strongly addressed during their school years, with Architecture students engaged through the Graduate Architecture Students' Association within the Engineering Undergraduate Society. They have financial opportunities to secure numerous bursaries, scholarships, teaching and research assistant positions that are designed to disperse opportunities widely.

Clear explanation of CEGEP intake and extracurricular industry activities enrich student experience. International exchanges are evident, though students expressed clarification is needed on U1 participation at Tongji University.

The Program supports students in preparation for entering professional organizations and takes pride in its successful alumni who have distinguished themselves in practice and academic circles.

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 ☐**

Tenure track faculty appears to have been reduced by approximately 1/3 since the last visit. 10 of 16 tenure track faculty have retired or resigned since 2018. Longstanding course instructors have helped address this reset as the Program recruits for a new tenure track position.

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 Macdonald-Harrington building is unique and beautiful, occupying a prominent location on the campus and has undergone extensive repairs and renovations to the building envelope, certain internal studio spaces and ventilation in the laser cutter room. Unfortunately, all of the next phase of planned interior renovations of the lecture halls, studios, offices, HVAC and electrical work (with exception of the elevator replacement) were put on hold by the University due to a provincial funding restriction. Notwithstanding the Program is "making the best out of this unfortunate situation," these deficiencies have become generational and cannot be deferred indefinitely. At the very least, the Program must develop an actionable capital improvement plan and proforma to address the following health and safety as well as operational aspects of the building:

- Upgrade base building ventilation.
- Upgrade electrical/lighting systems
- Upgrade Studio U1 (Rm115), staff and faculty offices, lecture halls, teaching spaces, and most support spaces
- Address inadequate workshop assembly spaces

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 architectural library collection at McGill (Humanities, Rare Books, and the Safdie Collection) is superior to most Programs in Canada. Due to circumstances beyond the control of the library system, that collection is only partly accessible on campus. The Visiting Team understands that the books relocated offsite are still available to the students through a one-day retrieval system. However, not being able to browse freely through the shelves severely limits the potential of exploration and discoveries. With the major renovation project being on hold, the future of the library as a space, is not clearly defined and an action plan is needed.

8. Financial Resources

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

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

The Program benefits from significant operating endowments and gifts. The Program also benefits from its relationship with Engineering through a flexible budget based on allocation, not activity. The budget is not proportional and noteworthy that Architecture operates at a modest loss, with the Faculty of Engineering making up the shortfall.

9. Administrative Structure (Academic Unit and 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 administration has restructured in response to previous VTR comments. Students, faculty, and staff have commented on the positive impact of these changes.

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 ☐**

This condition is met.

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 (PPCs)
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 ☐**
The presentation of Professional Development within the Program comprises of a wide-range of student-lead initiatives including the Brown Bag lecture series, job-fair, and networking events. The program supports students' engagement with the profession by providing resources and space. Insights from practice are brought into the classroom through guest reviewers in studios and Course Lecturers. Many students at the Graduate level are also working in architecture firms either for summer internships or part-time during semesters.

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 education is clearly positioned at the core of the curriculum through studio-based learning with linkages to social, technical, and professional courses. Strong student outcomes

are evident through numerous academic and award-winning projects. Greater clarity could be provided on how students are introduced to diverse AEC career pathways.

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 program understands environmental stewardship in its teaching of circular economies, zero carbon calculations, energy performance modelling, and repeated instances in project work of adaptive re-use, renovation, and restoration (well balanced with new construction). Initiatives in waste diversion and material re-use, from students and the Fabrication Lab, is appreciated, adding a tangible commitment to this philosophy.

In an overall allegiance to environmental stewardship, McGill University has committed to maintaining its Platinum sustainability rating under the STARS (Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System).

Regarding global perspectives, a notable yearly activity is McGill's participation in the Tongji Construction Festival in Shanghai – in 2024, six students participated.

At the level of recent faculty hiring, the work of recent hires reinforces the global perspectives already present in the research of the faculty. For example, the work of Samia Henni addresses contemporary global issues of "colonization, wars, resource extraction, deserts, forced displacement, and gender dynamics". The work of Célia Küpfer focus on "reuse, repair, and adaptation of the existing built environment at the intersection of architectural design, construction engineering, and ecology".

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 and leadership are fostered through peer-to-peer learning and a range of formal and informal extracurricular activities. Collaboration is an overarching pedagogical objective in the program critical in praxis. Partnerships with a range of groups support community engagement around initiatives such as a carbon-neutral mixed use district. Regular meetings between the director, staff, student associations, and tenure-track faculty strengthen dialogue and inclusion within the program.

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 are many examples (ARCH325, ARCH342, ARCH240, ARCH512; structures - ARCH241 and ARCH445; energy and environment - ARCH378, ARCH377, ARCH447; as well as ARCH672 Comprehensive Building Design), showing the program's commitment to education in Technical Knowledge. The inclusion of off-site tours of panelization and building manufacturing facilities afford students a unique access to current and emerging technologies currently deployed in the construction field. This said, students expressed interest in applying their learning by building details 1:1.

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 ☐**

Breadth of education is supported through the requirement to complete six courses outside the School of Architecture for Undergraduate and five courses for Graduate students. The visiting team also notes that the majority of the student intake have already taken courses such as humanities, sciences and technology during CEGEP, while those who come from out of province take U0 courses. Additional depth and flexibility are enabled through the Quebec Inter-University Transfer Agreement and optional minor concentrations (18-24 credits). These mechanisms broaden academic exposure beyond architecture.

11.2 Student Performance Criteria (SPCs)

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 ☐**

This is met in the sequence including ARCH405. The syllabus notes that 'Concept Design Strategies connect design process with theory, materiality, methods, and practice'.

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 ☐**

This is met in the sequence including ARCH303 Design and Construction 1 Fall 24, sited at Gorilla Park - for example with several biophilic design precedents cited in the low pass example for ARCH303-2024 - Assignment 2, Section 2.

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, modelling, simulation, and fabrication.

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

Students progressively develop and demonstrate proficiency with analog and digital design tools, ranging from sketching and model-making to BIM and digital fabrication, through coordinated coursework and studio sequences culminating in advanced, self-directed graduate design projects. The consistency in student design skill varies in proficiency.

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 learning in Program Analysis is shown in ARCH202 and ARCH673. It also loosely appears in design examples in ARCH672 studio work where the elements of a program and their configuration in a plan are present. It could be helpful if the Program gave examples of how students learn the basic and conventional components of a functional program, as used in general practice.

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 ☐**

ARCH375, ARCH405, ARCH673, and ARCH672 show evidence of meeting this SPC (strong presence of analysis response to site, topography and ecological systems).

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 evidence in ARCH673 and ARCH551 that satisfy this SPC, noting the contemporary relevance of the Montreal by Night theme of ARCH673, and the comprehensive quality of ARCH551.

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 ☑**
There is evidence in ARCH406 Course Option 1 and 3 that ample detail is there to meet the SPC. However, the syllabus for Option 2 does not mention any SPC A7 requirements related to detail design and minimal evidence was found in the work. It is conceivable that students taking Option 2 could navigate the program without satisfying this SPC.

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 ☐**
The Visiting Team found evidence in ARCH406 and ARCH672 demonstrating proficiency in a broad range of media and drawings.

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 ☐**

This is met in a sequence of courses including ARCH512, Architectural Modelling Fall 2024, for example, *Assignment 1: Unlikely Revit Model* provides a stimulating critical analysis and reasoning with respect to Revit modelling.

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 ☐**

This is met in the sequence of outstanding history courses including ARCH251, Winter 2025.

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 ARCH250, ARCH251, ARCH354, ARCH355, and ARCH512 (an excellent analysis of BIM and interdisciplinary relationships).

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 ARCH250, ARCH355, ARCH251 and ARCH354. Studio work, especially in ARCH305, shows work in communities with diverse cultures within the City of Montreal. Finally, close to 2/3 of the second year cohort study abroad (Australia, Austria, Italy, Belgium, France, Ireland, and China). In turn, students from many of those countries enter the Program on an exchange term.

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 ☐**

Evidence of basic principles of sustainable architecture, life-cycle, approaches and the circular economy, and climate and bio-climatic design is found in ARCH378.

ARCH377 explores sustainable design strategies in power and lighting while ARCH447 focuses on passive and active heating and ventilation as well as embodied carbon calculations in exterior wall assemblies.

ARCH375 examines flora-fauna systems as they relate to, and can be deployed in, landscapes and architecture alike. Students demonstrated knowledge of low impact development and green infrastructure in their site specific designs.

Studio work including Arch672 shows application of many of the principles learned above, as well as from faculty research.

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 ☑**

Although ARCH451 provides experience in reading and interpreting the building code, primarily from a building classification perspective, and ARCH551 provides contextual reference and critical examination of issues and trends in urban design, ARCH678 only examines wall sections that focus on architectural and structural coordination. There is little evidence of students learning of zoning, development bylaws, universal design, or the issues and considerations for designing or selecting architectural, mechanical, electrical or structural life-safety systems. The Program is encouraged to expose students to the full range of universal design considerations.

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 ☐**

In ARCH240, students develop foundational knowledge of material selection and performance through lectures and fabrication exercises that encourage exploration of common building materials and assemblies. This emphasis on exploration continues in ARCH378, ARCH377, ARCH447, and ARCH678, where students examine material performance, environmental impact, and integration within structural and envelope systems.

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 ☐**

Student work demonstrates familiarity with structural principles and their relationship to building materials and assemblies, introduced in ARCH240. This familiarity is further evident in upper-level coursework, where students investigate structural behaviour and its integration with envelope systems and environmental performance within architectural design.

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 ☐**

A graphic understanding of how building envelopes are assembled is shown in ARCH678 and ARCH672.

Additionally, the Visiting Team notices that ARCH406 is exemplary in Course Options 1 and 3, but absent in Option 2, meaning some students may not learn envelope detailing. Didactic exploration of the practical sequencing of construction, to achieve the assemblies, would be beneficial. It is important that the other courses listed, though not directly related to the detail of the envelope, look at other equally critical perspectives including energy performance and day-lighting. The curriculum contributes to an understanding of building skins in this way.

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 ☐**

ARCH378 provides sound contextual foundation for understanding vernacular and contemporary precedents. ARCH377, ARCH447, ARCH627 provide focused investigation, testing and evaluation of envelope materials and systems in a design scenario. It is commendable that large scale sections are developed in ARCH678, but the work could benefit from a review from a constructability perspective.

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 ☑**
Student work presented in ARCH672 provides evidence of using an existing structure as "artifact" on the site, and does a commendable job on parametric modelling. However, the projects do not go far enough to demonstrate ability to integrate or incorporate environmental systems. Specifically, its analysis and application within the design is not evident.

There is minimal evidence of students developing active or passive environmental system building strategies, as part of a comprehensive design, as required by this SPC. Further, it is uncertain that students developed an analysis that meets basic regulatory requirements.

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 evidence of students obtaining practice experience in ARCH674 for understanding the professional Code of Ethics (duty of care of architects to their clients), preparing a fee proposal and making a recommendation for material selection. There is also evidence in ARCH451 for students to learn how to read and interpret the building code from a building classification perspective. The High and Low Pass work for RFP's were generally satisfactory but students could benefit by having scopes of work that are connected to the evaluation criterion as well as developing an understanding of realistic schedules. Listed lectures appear to provide students with a high-level understanding of the role and organization of the regulator, protection of the public, pathways to licensure and the Architects Act. Rights and responsibilities of interns and employees appear only tangentially covered.

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 ☐**

ARCH674 provides reasonable evidence for highlighting some of the issues at play in developing professional judgment as well as the role of the regulator and the architect's professional responsibilities in this regard. ARCH451 provides experience in reading and interpreting the building code. Advocacy for the profession (there is no apostrophe in *Architects Act*) versus advocacy for environmental, social and cultural issues is a core distinction that isn't apparent in the syllabi or presented work.

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 ☑**

ARCH674 touches lightly on aspects of this SPC. There is little evidence of marketing, project management and risk management. The Program is encouraged to expand these important aspects of practice.

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 ☑**

While ARCH674 touches on the contract and management of a variety of project delivery types, there is no evidence this includes different forms of client-architect and contractor agreements. As such, the students are not achieving the level of *understanding* in the work presented.

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 ☑**

The visiting team did not find evidence that the students are achieving the level of *understanding,* particularity for work plans, project schedules, and cost control and management, in the work presented in ARCH674 to meet this SPC.

IV. Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

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

1- Brief History of the Institution

McGill's 200-year history is made of thousands of stories, events, and experiences. Highlights from the Institution timeline is presented on the McGill website under the following themes.

- **General History**: Explore the significant events and people who have shaped McGill into the university it is today.
- **Built Environment**: Discover stories behind the rich architecture of McGill's buildings, some of which are amongst Montreal's oldest.
- **Impact**: Uncover events and discoveries representing some of McGill's greatest contributions to the world.
- **Changing Faces**: Delve into the stories of people who have paved the way for so many in the evolution of the University's diversity.
- **McGill in the Community**: Learn about McGillians' direct influence in Montreal and in Quebec.

2- Institutional Mission

The mission of McGill University is the advancement of learning and the creation and dissemination of knowledge, by offering the best possible education, by carrying out research and scholarly activities judged to be excellent by the highest international standards, and by providing service to society.

3- Program History

The School of Architecture at McGill University was founded in 1896, when a chair in architecture was established in the Faculty of Applied Science (today, the Faculty of Engineering) by Sir William C. Macdonald. At that time, the program leading to the professional degree was four years and the School operated in the Macdonald Engineering Building under the leadership of its first Director, Stewart Henbest Capper.

The School of Architecture is now one of eight units reporting to the Dean of the Faculty of Engineering. This includes six engineering departments— Bioengineering, Chemical Engineering, Civil Engineering, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Mechanical Engineering, and Mining and Materials Engineering—and two Schools, the School of Urban Planning and the Peter Guo-hua Fu School of Architecture.

Since 1987, the Schools of Architecture and Urban Planning have been housed in the Macdonald-Harrington Building, which was constructed to accommodate the Departments of Chemistry and Mining by architect Sir Andrew Taylor in 1896; and renovated for the two Schools by architects Ray Affleck and Arcop Associates. Through a generous gift, in 2017 the School of Architecture was renamed the Peter Guo-hua Fu School of Architecture.

4- Program Mission

The School of Architecture educates professionals who contribute to the global community through the design, construction, and interpretation of the built environment. The School:

- provides a diverse environment for teaching, learning, and research, supported by both traditional and state-of-the-art resources.
- offers professional and post-professional research-based Master's and Ph.D. programs that enable graduates to contribute ethically to the profession, to research, and to careers in related fields.
- enriches multi-disciplinary teaching and research within the University and with other local and international universities.
- engages citizens' groups, local, provincial, and national governments, the private sector, and the profession toward the improvement of the built environment.
- presents undergraduate and graduate students with educational opportunities for global engagement by maintaining a large cohort of international students and through international exchanges.

5- Program Action Plan

Since the last accreditation visit, there have been four major occurrences that have changed or will change the positioning of the School of Architecture within the institution.

In fall 2024, the Dean's Office has put the School of Architecture Accreditation process into the portfolio of the Associate Dean of Faculty Affairs. This symbolically and operationally integrates the accredited professional program with the accredited professional program in the rest of the Faculty of Engineering.

In fall 2025, the Dean's Office will be striking a committee to examine the budgets and resources of the two Schools in the Faculty of Engineering, the School of Architecture and the School of Urban Planning. The last exercise at this level took place in 2014.

The Office of the Provost and Executive Vice-President (Academic) has revised guidelines for program creation and revision. Future objectives for curriculum development in the School of Architecture must align upcoming changes in the administration of academic programs across the University, according to new guidelines implemented in the 2025-26 academic year. https://www.mcgill.ca/aptap/academic-programs-and-courses.

In 2025, McGill University instituted Horizon McGill to examine and improve McGill's processes University-wide. Potential changes resulting from this initiative are wide-ranging, including administrative re-organization and new budgeting process, i.e. a switch from a provostial model to an activity-based model—or, more likely, a hybrid of the two. https://www.mcgill.ca/horizon-mcgill-program.

Appendix B: The Visiting Team *(Names & Contact Information)*

MEMBERS OF THE VISITING TEAM

VOTING MEMBERS

Sean F. Rodrigues; Architect AIBC, FRAIC
Team Chair - Practitioner
srodrigues@rcav.org

Marie-Paule Macdonald; Architect OAQ
Educator
mpmacdonald@uwaterloo.ca

Vincent Hui; BES, MArch, MBA, MRAIC
Educator
vincent.hui@torontomu.ca

Rodney Kirkwood; Architect NWTAA
Practitioner
rodney.kirkwood@stantec.com

Nolan Miranda; Architecture Student
Student
nolanmiranda2000@gmail.com

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Harrison Lane; Intern Architect
Intern
hdslane@gmail.com

Philippe Lemay; Architect OAQ
Practitioner
philippe.lemay@glcrmarchitectes.com

OBSERVERS

Zoë Campbell
CACB-CCCA
accreditation@cacb.ca

Izabel Amaral
CCUSA Observer
izabel.amaral@umontreal.ca

Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

Virtual Pre-Visit Planning

Wednesday, January 21st **11:30AM – 12:30PM EST** Student Work Access	• 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 **Monday, February 2nd** **10:30AM – 11:30AM EST** 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 **Friday, February 6th** **10:30AM – 11:30AM EST** 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 **Friday, February 13th** **1:30PM – 2:30PM EST** Review and Discussions	• The Visiting Team review the APR, CACB Conditions and Procedures, and visit protocols, and identify missing materials • The Team members discuss their initial reactions to the APR and student work, raise any initial concerns, and identify and prioritize the questions to be addressed during the documentary review
Meeting #4 **Friday, February 27th** **10:00AM – 11:00AM EST** **---** **Thursday, March 5th** **11:30AM – 12:30PM EST** 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 • Team develops a draft VTR • Entrance Meeting with Librarian o David Greene; david.greene@mcgill.ca o Jennifer Garland; jennifer.garland@mcgill.ca o Tellina Liu; tellina.liu@mcgill.ca

The Visit

Thursday **March 12th** (Virtual)	**11:00AM –12:30PM EST**	• Team Deliberations and Launch of draft VTR
Friday **March 13th** (Virtual)	**AM**	• 10:30AM – 11:30AM EST: Entrance Meeting with the Program Head o David Theodore ▪ david.theodore@mcgill.ca

		• 12:30PM – 1:30PM EST: Entrance Meeting with the Provost
		  ○ Angela Campbell
		  ▪ Provost and Executive Vice-President (Academic); angela.campbell@mcgill.ca
		• 2:00PM – 2:45PM EST: Entrance Meeting with the University President
		  ○ Deep Saini
		  ▪ President and Vice-Chancellor; deep.saini@mcgill.ca
		• 3:15PM – 4:00PM EST: Entrance Meeting with Dean
		  ○ Viviane Yargeau
		  ▪ Dean of the Faculty of Engineering; Viviane.yargeau@mcgill.ca

	PM	• Review of General Studies, Electives, and Related Programs • Continued Review of Exhibits and Records • Continued Team Deliberations and Drafts of VTR
Saturday March 14th	Travel Day	

Sunday March 15th (On-Site)	**AM**	• Visiting Team Arrival and Hotel Check-In
		  ○ Delta Hotels Montreal
		  ▪ 475 President-Kennedy Avenue, Montreal, QC H3A 1J7
		• 11:30AM EST: Visiting Team Introductions and Orientation
		  ○ Restaurant Holder
		  ▪ 407 Rue McGill

	PM	• 12:50PM: Introduction Meeting with Program Head
		  ○ Team Room: Macdonald-Harrington (MDHAR) 207
		• 1:00PM: Tour of Facilities
		• 3:30PM: Team Debriefing Session
		  ○ Team Room: Macdonald-Harrington (MDHAR) 207
		• 5:00PM EST: Team-only Dinner
		  ○ Monarque
		  ▪ 406 rue Saint-Jacques
		• 7:30PM – 10:30PM: Team Working Session: Development of Draft VTR
		  ○ Delta Hotel Meeting Room

Monday March 16th (On-Site)	**AM**	• 8:00AM: Team Working Breakfast with Program Head
		  ○ Delta Hotel Restaurant
		• 10:00AM: Meeting with Administrative Staff
		  ○ MDHAR 101
		• 11:00AM: Meeting with Part-Time Instructors
		  ○ MDHAR 114
		• TDB: Observation of Studios

	PM	• 12:00PM: Meeting with Students (Pizza Lunch)

		○ MDHAR 114 Exhibition Room • 2:30PM: Meeting with Academic Staff ○ MDHAR 101 • 4:30PM: Meeting with the Student Representatives ○ MDHAR 101 • 5:30PM: Team Debriefing Session ○ Team Room: Macdonald-Harrington (MDHAR) 207 • 6:00PM: Team-only Dinner ○ Restaurant Henri ▪ 1238 R. du Square-Phillips • 7:30PM – 10:30PM: Team Working Session: Debriefing, Draft of VTR, Strengths and Causes of Concern ○ Delta Hotel Meeting Room
Tuesday March 17th (On-Site)	**AM**	• 8:30AM: Team Breakfast with the Program Head ○ Delta Hotel Restaurant • Follow-up Meeting (with Faculty, Students, Director, and Staff, as needed) • 10:00AM – 12:00PM: Team Lunch & Final Team Deliberations and Vote ○ Team Room: Macdonald-Harrington (MDHAR) 207 ▪ Traiteur Julien Leblanc
	PM	• 12:30PM – 1:00PM: Exit Meeting with Program Head ○ MDHAR 206 ▪ David Theodore; Program Head • 1:30PM – 2:00PM: Exit Meeting with Dean ○ Macdonald Engineering Building (MD88) ▪ Viviane Yargeau; Dean of the Faculty of Engineering • 2:00PM – 2:30PM: Exit Meeting with Provost and President ○ President's office (James Admin, Room 506) ▪ Deep Saini; President and Vice-Chancellor ▪ Angela Campbell; Provost and Executive Vice-President (Academic) • 3:00PM: Team Debrief and VTR Working Session ○ Team Room: Macdonald-Harrington (MDHAR) 207 • 6:00PM: Team-only Dinner ○ Toqué! ▪ 900 Pl. Jean-Paul-Riopelle • Check Out from the Hotel and Travel Home at their Leisure

V. Report Signatures

DocuSigned by:
Sean Rodrigues
186F227BA779401...

Sean F. Rodrigues
Chair
representing the Practitioners

Signed by:
53A83B12011F4DB...

Rodney Kirkwood
representing the Practitioners

Signed by:
Marie-Paule Macdonald
F1E5227AA48A430...

Marie-Paule Macdonald
representing the Educators

Signed by:
8622E1FA2EFE4FE...

Vincent Hui
representing the Educators

Signed by:
Nolan Miranda
1B5BD83B5F6A4E4...

Nolan Miranda
representing the Students

Signed by:
Harrison Lane
2FC2DF37779F40A...

Harrison Lane
CACB Non-Voting Member

Signed by:
Philipe Lemay
FE6C048DE3F243B...

Philippe Lemay
CACB Non-Voting Member

Signed by:
5FA3B8639CD5450...

Zoë Capmbell
CACB Observer

Signé par :
434489CCB50F4B8...

Izabel Amaral
CCUSA Observer

McGill University's Response to the Final Visiting Team Report (VTR)

Degree: Master of Architecture, M.Arch

March 15 – 17, 2026

Program response to the VT Chair's response and Final VTR: 29 April 2026
Final Draft McGill University Visiting Team Report (VTR)-2026

We appreciate this opportunity to continue the dialogue. On April 7 we submitted a report (see below) in response to the Draft VTR. On April 13, we received a brief reply from the Visiting Team Chair, which indicated that it was not possible to provide further detail regarding the evidence underlying the stated concerns or the criteria not met.

As previously noted, we found the Visiting Team's work to be thoughtful and engaged. However, we remain concerned that the April 13 response did not address the questions raised in our submission. Therefore, this message, addressed to the CACB Board, is intended to reiterate our concerns regarding the implications of the VTR. We respectfully encourage the Board to consider whether clear standards of evidence were articulated, whether sufficient evidence was presented, and whether the resulting conclusions logically follow from that evidence.

1) For example, the Chair wrote (full response included below for reference):

> It is not within the Team's mandate to provide detailed prescriptions or specific lists of actions required to achieve compliance. This respectfully remains within the gift of the University and indeed the Program to determine for themselves, as part of your unique identity and selling point to the market. [...]
>
> As a suggestion for your consideration, I would encourage you and your team to have the wording of the SPCs, the evidence provided and VT comments in front of you and carefully/objectively discern this with "fresh eye" and unfamiliar spectacles.

We are not asking for prescriptions; it is the other way around. We are seeking clarifications of what the Team sees as issues, so that we can formulate actionable responses.

2) In the same manner, the four "Causes of Concern" are stated in ways that do not allow actionable responses. For example, the VTR states in Cause of Concern No 1:

> "Increasing reliance on sessional course instructors is increasing pressure on tenure-track faculty for administrative and other service appointments."

This appears to be an inference rather than a statement grounded in evidence. The causal relationship in fact operates in the opposite direction. The use of sessional instructors can relieve tenure-track faculty of teaching commitments, thereby enabling them to devote greater time and energy to administrative and service positions.

3) Most importantly, we are concerned that the Visting Team has not specified the health and safety issues they have identified. We feel strongly that any health and safety concerns must be addressed immediately and thoroughly; however, without an indication of the specific issues observed, we are not in a position to take the appropriate and timely action.

First response to Draft VTR: Tuesday 7 April 2026

Thank you for the prompt and very thorough draft VTR. We commend the Visiting Team for their thoughtfulness and engagement.

Section 2.3.2 of the Procedures for Accreditation asks us to review "the draft VTR for corrections of fact" and make "appropriate revisions and/or responses." Our response is a request for more facts from the Visiting Team. We ask for precision on what facts count as evidence (or a standard of evidence) so that we may understand how to set a clear goal and path to action to address the conditions indicated as "not met" in the draft VTR.

For example, it is difficult to respond to the need to "upgrade support spaces" without knowing what the Team counts as "support spaces" and what the Team identifies as requiring "upgrading" to meet CACB standards.

SPCs

In the SPCs section, for the "not met" criteria C1, D1, E3, E4, and E5, we would like to understand what factual standards we might use to judge if we have moved from "minimal evidence" to evidence that would satisfy the Team's standard of judgement.

This call for precision stems from our belief that C1, E3, E4, and E5 are robustly covered in two courses, ARCH 628 (Building Regulations and Safety) and ARCH 674 (Professional Practice). Indeed, these are flagship courses of our program. They were considered "met" in the last (2018) VTR; it was the same instructor and the same courses. Additionally, we have evidence from the success of our students gaining professional licensure after graduation (i.e. outcomes on the ExAC) that the SPCs have been met.

Space and Technology Resources

In the "not met" category of Space and Technology Resources, we would also welcome some precision in order to be able to respond. We request specific facts about:

- What physical resources are causing safety issues?
- What physical resources are causing health issues?
- What electricity needs to be upgraded? What issues is electricity causing?
- What lighting needs to be upgraded? What issues is lighting causing?
- Which offices and staff spaces do not meet CACB standards?
- Which "teaching spaces" and "support spaces" need upgrades? What would count as an "upgrade"?

- We currently have approximately 275 sq metres available for model assembly. A typical studio for 45 students is 205 sq metres. How much more model assembly space is required to satisfy the CACB standard?

In conclusion, we agree on the importance of facts and would welcome guidance on the evidence the Visiting Team used in its assessment of certain courses and our space and technology resources. We appreciate your consideration and thank you for providing any additional information.

April 13, 2026; reply from the Visiting Team Chair

From: Sean Rodrigues [mailto:srodrigues@rcav.org]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2026 11:02 AM
To: David Theodore, Prof <david.theodore@mcgill.ca>
Cc: CACB Accreditation-Agrement du CCCA <accreditation@cacb.ca>; Zoë Campbell <zcampbell@CACB.ca>
Subject: Final Draft Visiting Team Report (McGill University M.Arch)

Happy Easter David,

Thank you for carefully reviewing and providing your detailed response to the draft VTR.

It may be helpful to clarify the role of the Visiting Team in this process. The Team's responsibility is to assess the program against the accreditation condition and performance criteria and identify where those criteria are or are not being met, based on the evidence provided by the Program and available during the visit. It is not within the Team's mandate to provide detailed prescriptions or specific lists of actions required to achieve compliance. This respectfully remains within the gift of the University and indeed the Program to determine for themselves, as part of your unique identity and selling point to the market.

In that context, whilst the Visiting Team have identified a few areas as "not met," the intention is to highlight where gaps exist to the stated criterion, rather than to define exact solutions or thresholds. Determining how best to address those gaps, and what specific measures are appropriate, intentionally rests with the Program. As a suggestion for your consideration, I would encourage you and your team to have the wording of the SPCs, the evidence provided and VT comments in front of you and carefully/objectively discern this with "fresh eye" and unfamiliar spectacles.

In regard to identifying facts in need of correction, I see that you have not identified any. As such, the next step is to close the VTR review and move to finalization. I thank you (again) for your hospitality, commend the good work that McGill is doing and your commitment to making the program stronger.

Best,

Sean

Archdiocese of Vancouver

Sean F. Rodrigues, Architect AIBC FRAIC
Director, Property & Infrastructure

C (604) 219-0802
rcav.org | beholdvancouver.org