CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL CERTIFICATION BOARD

CONSEIL CANADIEN DE CERTIFICATION EN ARCHITECTURE

2026 Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture Program. M.Arch.

Institution: Toronto Metropolitan 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 9
5. Causes of Concern and Team's Recommendations 10

III. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation 11

IV. Appendices 26

Appendix A: Program Information 26
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 Organization 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 team would like to thank our hosts and acknowledge that the visit was exceptionally well organized and managed. The Architecture Program Report was well written and transparent, the exhibition of the student work was clear and easily navigated, and our questions and needs well addressed in a timely manner.

The team acknowledges Dr. Lisa Landrum, Program Head, who was engaged and professional. We also note Dean Sri Krishnan, Associate Dean Dimitri Androutsos and Dr. Roberta Iannacito-Provenzano, Provost & Vice-President Academic, who recognized the importance of their accredited school of architecture within the TMU community, and are motivated to make it a leader in the Canadian architectural landscape.

The structure of the Program, the organization of the curriculum, the student enrichment offerings, and the provision of a thesis capstone year are unquestionably commendable. It is clear that the opportunity to forge a new and vital accredited program over the last twenty years has been fully seized by the Program and its leaders.

The team recommends leveraging the significant experience and expertise of the Program's faculty and staff to collaboratively contribute to the Program's decision-making processes.

The team recognizes the exceptional talent and commitment of the student leadership, whose energetic efforts in numerous student organizations—across several decades—are crucial to the Program's success and its unique culture. Their work is almost exclusively funded through TMU's undergraduate Architectural Science Student Society fee and their own fundraising efforts.\

The broader financial context of post-secondary education in the province of Ontario was often referenced in reviewing the APR and coming to terms with the Program, Faculty and University. We recognize that this context lies outside the purview of a CACB Visiting Team, while at the same time acknowledge the presence of a historic financial challenge to the Program. The repercussions of this issue are present in maintaining appropriate physical and human resources for an accredited school of architecture. We understand periodic circumstances where faculty and staff are overworked, that students do not have access to adequate creation spaces, and facilities do not meet current building code requirements. However, the team cannot support these conditions as long-term operational facts.

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 2019 VTR identified seven Causes of Concern. Within the time-frame between the last accreditation visit and this one, five of the seven Causes of Concern have been successfully addressed while a sixth Causes of Concern was partially addressed.

***Concern 1**. Ongoing building health and safety conditions, space issues and need for a clear, institutionally-supported plan for their resolution.* **Not addressed, refer to Space and Technology Resources.**

***Concern 2**. Lack of clarity with respect to the place of the Department within the Faculty and the effectiveness of the Department's advocacy on their own behalf.* **Addressed.**

***Concern 3**. Public awareness of the Program nationally, internationally and occasionally within the University, could be strengthened by increased attention to public information as the nature and achievements of the developing professional Master's program move beyond historic strengths of technical skills and employability.* **Addressed.**

***Concern 4.** No clear Operating Policies and Procedures for Program administration staff, sometimes resulting in conflicting or inconsistent direction from faculty members and a sense by staff that they are not valued.* **Addressed to some extent however there remains key human resource issues related to the administrative staff. Refer to Faculty and Staff Resources.**

***Concern 5**. Ability of the Computer Lab to provide the number and capability of computer stations as demands of new software exceeds capabilities of the students' personal computers.* **Addressed.**

***Concern 6**. Balance of technical focus and critical thinking early in the program.* **Addressed.**

***Concern 7**. Weak application of Global Perspectives in Architecture and Urban Design studio work.* **Addressed.**

2.2.1 Condition #6 Space and Technology Resources (Not Met). **Not Addressed. Please refer to Space and Technology Resources. This Condition was part of a focused evaluation by the CACB in 2022.**

2.2.2 – SPC B4. Cultural Diversity and Global Perspectives (Not Met). **Addressed.**

4. Program Strengths

The integration of architecture, building science and project management in the undergraduate Bachelor of Architectural Science degree exposes the students to a depth and diversity of disciplinary perspectives.

The Faculty and Program leadership are committed to the systematic review and validation of the curriculum.

The faculty have built a national and international reputation for creative design and interdisciplinary research, which raises the profile of the Program and the University.

The thesis year provides the opportunity for students to test their gained knowledge in a more self-directed manner and within project circumstances that importantly explore the boundaries of architectural thought.

The Program offers a robust spectrum of student enrichment opportunities including studio options, studies abroad, exchange programs, lecture series, design-build studios, and a series of opportunities to collaborate with partners in industry, the profession, and the broader community.

The location of the school in downtown Toronto offers the students a vital laboratory for the study of urban and architectural conditions while the proximity to a large number of architectural offices facilitates a meaningful relationship between practitioners, faculty and students.

The Program continues to garner an excellent reputation for training graduates who are conversant in the conditions and requirements of architectural practice.

The students have access to a strong co-op program reinforcing and animating the Program's strength in developing practice-ready graduates.

A diverse spectrum of student organizations are active and responsible for a variety of events, mentorship, and student services that are an immense contribution to the Program's culture and the student experience.

5. Causes of Concern and Team's Recommendations

Cause of Concern 1: Although the team acknowledges the Program's efforts in addressing this on-going issue, there remain significant deficiencies in space and technology resources. Urgency in addressing this concern exists given the issues are building code related, and are affecting critical accessibility conditions and human comfort. Equally important from a CACB perspective is the students' access to adequate working space for the necessary simultaneous design-making process in both analogue and digital platforms. Through this lens, the studio space currently allocated per student in studio is fundamentally inadequate.

Cause of Concern 2: In the context of the addition of new programs, greater student enrollment, faculty retirements with only limited success in their replacement, and a disproportionally large contingent of part-time instructors, the program lacks adequate numbers of full-time faculty and support staff.

Cause of Concern 3: Although many are valued and exceptional, the unconventionally large contingent of part-time instructors is creating a type of communication entropy that negatively impacts the coordination of course delivery and consistency in teaching.

Cause of Concern 4: The Department of Architectural Science operates with an ongoing structural deficit. Many core CACB requirements are unfunded, and can only be provided through Program fundraising.

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 subcondition. 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 ☐**

Evidence is provided of self-assessment processes and results at the University, Faculty and Program levels, including an Institutional Quality Assurance Process and Periodic Program Reviews. Evidence and feedback is gathered through meetings, retreats, and forums with faculty and administration, and surveys addressed to students, alumni, faculty and employers of graduates.

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 ☐**

Evidence under the FEAS "Quality Assurance of Programs" link provides the required statements from the CACB. Evidence is also presented on the M.Arch. Master of Architecture Program link, Appendix 3.2.1 for B.Arch.Sc. Brochure under "Graduate Studies", and in communications between the Program and the student body under Appendix 3.2.3 for CACB information to students.

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 ☐**

Evidence is provided by the Program to conform to provincial and institutional policies and specific to the school are extensive and clearly stated. Evidence of communication is provided in EDI Tools for 3.3.2 Bachelor of Architectural Sciences (B.Arch Sci.) 3.3.1 Master of Architecture (M.Arch), and the Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan 2025-2030 outlining how students are engaging through curriculum, communication, outreach and recruitment, culture and knowledge, student experience, and definitions.

4. Student Composition, Well-Being, and Enrichment

The Program must demonstrate that it provides support and encouragement for students to achieve their full potential during their school years and later in the profession, as well as an interpersonal milieu that embraces cultural differences. The Program must demonstrate that it benefits from and contributes to its institutional values.

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

Evidence is provided of guest lectures, visiting critics, seminars, and public exhibitions of student and faculty work. In addition, TMU, FEAS, and DAS include ample student support initiatives and communications to students.

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 ☑**

Evidence provided in the APR indicates there is a deficit of existing faculty and administrative staff.

The ratio of student to faculty in studios is not greater than 15:1 as required by CACB.

DAS full-time faculty numbers twenty-five as of September 2025. Since 2019 the overall faculty number has decreased by four, through retirements and departures. A search for a Tier 2 CRC in Building Science was confirmed as an internal recommendation in 2025. New faculty have not been confirmed for the 2026-2027 school year. Searches for a full-time tenure track position and a one-year limited term full-time position are anticipated as of July 1, 2026.

DAS has four academic programs (BArchSc, Grad Architecture, Grad BldgSc, and Grad PMBE), plus Mobility and Coop/Experiential Learning. Each area has an Associate Chair (6 Assoc. Chairs altogether), plus the Department Chair, who receive course releases for filling these positions. Although these faculty members are included in the overall architecture full-time faculty count, they do not fulfill a full course load delivery. The Associate Dean Graduate

Studies, also included in the full-time faculty count, receives a three course release and does not fulfill a full course delivery in DAS.

The PhD programs in Building Science and Architecture were established in 2019 and 2024 respectively with the caveat that neither additional funding, administrative support nor space would be available upon their initiation. The 1.5 Graduate Program Administrator positions which were in place in 2022 to launch the graduate PMBE program was reduced to 1 position in fall 2023.

This decreased number of faculty exists within an environment of an additional 10 students to be enrolled mandated for fall 2026.

The number of contract lecturers has increased from 40% in 2018-19 to 54% in 2025-26. The ratio of courses and course sections provided by contract lecturers was 40% in 2018-19 and is 52% for 2025-26. Contract lecturers provide almost 60% of studio courses. The proportion of contract lecturers places strain on faculty and staff for administrative support of non-faculty members as well as potential lack of coordination between faculty and contract lecturers impinging upon consistent curriculum delivery.

The deficit of full-time faculty and proportion of contract lecturers results in program vacancies in teaching scopes such as Indigenous design and digital skills as well as limited availability of M.Arch. Thesis supervisors.

The 2025 Periodic Program Review for the Bachelor of Architectural Science and Master of Architecture programs identified an urgent need to increase full-time faculty to enable appropriate delivery of DAS programs. The TMU ArchSc PRT Report and TMU ArchSc PRT Program Response & Implementation Plan indicates concerns regarding faculty and staff resources.

There are twelve administrative and technical staff. The workshop is utilized by undergraduate and graduate students; significant demands are placed on the workshop team members as noted in the APR.

The department has expanded from two Master Degree programs, (Architecture and Building Science) to three Master Degree programs (with the addition of Project Management).

Administrative staff have experienced a reduction in numbers as well as introduction of new programs and increased student numbers.

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 ☑**

There has been notable progress since the FETR in 2023 addressing building code compliance issues such as upgrading HVAC and fire alarm systems. However, further building code compliance and human comfort deficiencies persist in the form of the absence of accessible washrooms and an underperforming building envelope, respectively. The team encourages the program to produce the "Strategic Plan" mentioned in the FETR (2023) outlining capital projects of urgent building upgrades that is understood by the university administration as 'shovel-ready'.

Additionally, exclusive design studio space allocated for each full-time student is inadequate for the seamless integration between analogue and digital workflows necessary in a holistic studio design culture as required for this condition. Additional barriers include difficulty accessing workshop and digital fabrication resources due to overlap between hours of operation and class time.

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 team found evidence that Librarians are resourceful in providing necessary services for students through workshops, in-person conversations, and Librarian availability to students. Evidence is provided in APR 3.7.1 Library Report indicating academic supports, Library expenditures, in-person and online resources indicated in Appendix 2: Selected Electronic Resources Supporting Architecture and Appendix 3 - Google Scholar Metrics Top 20 Architecture (Engineering & Computer Science) Journals.

8. Financial Resources

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

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

Since 2023-24, the program has operated with a structural deficit of approximately $600,000. Core professional development activities for students in accredited architecture programs such as field trips and other off-campus activities, participation in student professional societies, guest lectures, visiting critics, and exhibitions lack stable funding, as do the design builds which form a central part of the program's culture. At present, these activities are possible only through funding from student organizations and fundraising efforts.

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 team reviewed the organizational structure of the University, Faculty and Department of Architectural Science, including the role of the Yeates School of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies. The team considers that the Program exists in an adequately supportive framework with a strong degree of potential collaboration. In addition, the administrative structure offers the necessary autonomy commensurate with other Programs in Canada.

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 ☐**

Throughout the APR and this Visiting Team Report, "architecture program" refers to the professional architecture curriculum delivered by the Department of Architectural Science at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. This includes both the two-year professional

Master of Architecture program and the four-year pre-professional Bachelor of Architectural Science program.

A portion of the B.Arch.Sc. Program may be required by students entering the MArch program with another degree and which part depends on the nature and content of the first degree. In this case the Associate Chair considers placement and/or make-up courses on a case-by-case basis in compliance with the CACB requirements and TMU's internal policies and standards.

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 ☐**
In keeping with the history of the Program, preparing graduates for the profession is a key aspect of student development. Exposure to professional opportunity, career paths, internship

& licensure is provided in course format through ASC 102, 304, 522, 622, and 752 with broader issues related to professional ethics, inclusivity and professional collaboration presented in the AR 8104 seminar course.
The program engages the profession through multiple avenues such as guest lectures, DAS Lecture Series, Timber Fever, public symposiums, industry events and networking events aimed at providing opportunities for students to gain exposure to the profession.

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 ☐**
The Bachelor of Architectural Science and Master of Architecture programs are based on integrated cultural, technical and design courses with increasing complexity year by year, curated by studio coordinators. Courses ASC 201, 206, 301, 306, 401, and 406 provide evidence of this approach.

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 ☐**
Evidence of global and non-western history and theory courses is found in course work from ASC206, 306, 406, and 523. Further student opportunities are found in the DAS lecture series. Evidence of this is found in PPC posters and the summaries the DAS Lecture Series with presentations on indigenous community perspectives and City of Toronto affordable housing challenges by local and global subject matter experts.

Demonstration and evidence of environmental stewardship is provided within information and student work for ASC 200 and201.

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 ☐**
The Program consistently provides examples for compliance with this PPC. Students are given opportunities in all years of the program to participate in group activities and respond to collective decision making in their own work as seen in ASC 102, 205, /605, and 620. A variety of student leadership opportunities, including student mentoring, student societies, as well as

community initiatives provide students a framework to exercise relevant knowledge in a broader, academic adjacent, context. Student groups are notably active and indicate an engaged student body.

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 students are well prepared in core skills and technical knowledge. Faculty and the department expose students to engineering and building science technologies, supporting students' ability to use current and evolving tools and methods. Evidence is shown through required technical coursework, including ASC 200, 302, 402, 521, 623, and CVL 407.

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

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met ☑** **Not Met ☐**
The structure of the Program provides a broad education prior to student concentration in the final year of the B. Arch. Sc. One required English course and a 6+2 elective course structure provide students with further opportunities to explore six core electives related to their degree and two elective courses that allow possible pursuit of a minor. Options to go on exchange and compete for a co-op placement opportunity are also available for students.

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 ☐**
Evidence of student ability to articulate a design process is found in AR8101 Studio in Critical Practice. Evidence is also found in studios: ASC 201, 301, 401, 520; AR 8101, and 8103 and course AR 8110.

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 of student ability to apply theories, methods, and precedents is found in studio courses in year one, two, and three of the Bachelor of Architectural Science as well as year one of the Master of Architecture program. Specifically, evidence was found in Studios ASC 101, 201, 301, 401, 520, 620; AR 8101, 8103.

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 ☐**

Student ability develops over the course of studios from the first year of the Bachelor of Architectural Science through to the first year of Master of Architecture as evidenced by the work provided for review in studios: ASC 201, 301, 520, and 620; AR 8101 and 8103.

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 student ability to analyze and respond to a complex program is found in work provided from studios: ASC 201, 401, and 520.

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 ☐**

Students demonstrate site context and design analysis ability as evidenced in studios: ASC 201, 401, 520, AR 8101 and 8103, which occur in each year of undergraduate and graduate programs. Evidence is also provided in course ASC 403.

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 ☐**

Student ability to analyze and respond to the urban context is demonstrated by and evidence found in ASC 401 and ASC 520 Integration Studio I Complex Building Feasibility Study.

A7. Detail Design

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

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

Evidence of student ability to assess appropriate materials, components, and assemblies is found in course work in the first and third years of the Bachelor of Architectural Science degree courses ASC 202, 621, 623.

A8. Design Documentation

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

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

Evidence of student ability to document and present a design project is found across all three years of the Bachelor of Architectural Science program and the first year of the Master of Architecture program in studios: ASC 101, 201, 301, 401, 520 and AR 8101, 8103.

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 ☐**

Evidence of student ability to think critically and communicate effectively is found across all three years of the Bachelor of Architectural Science program and the first year of the Master of Architecture program in student work from the following courses: ASC 101, 103, 201, 206, 301, 306, 401, 406, 520, 620, and 621 and AR 8101, 8102, 8106, 8109, and 8110.

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 ☐**
Evidence of student understanding of the history of architecture and urban design is found in student work from the following courses: ARC 206, 306, 406, and 523.

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 of student understanding of architectural theory is found in student from the following course: ARC 206, 306, 406, and 523.

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 ☐**
This condition for accreditation had been indicated as "Not Met" in the 2019 VTR. Evidence of understanding is provided in courses ASC 101, 201, 206, 301, 401, 403, 406, and 523. Evidence of understanding Indigenous Worldviews is provided in ASC 201 and 206.

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 team found evidence of student understanding of Ecological Systems in ASC200, 403, 406, 520, 523, and AR8106. The Team found evidence in AR8101 and 8103, in which students have significant ability to combine natural and human ecological systems in studio projects.

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 ☐**

Courses ASC 200, 202, 303, 402, 403, and 622 provide evidence that students have an understanding of regulatory concerns such as zoning analysis, building Codes and Energy Performance and the Architects' Act. ASC 622 in particular contains a very strong assignment on the completion of a Code Matrix. Studios ASC 401, 520, and 620 demonstrate sufficient evidence to that students have an understanding of the regulatory framework that applies to professional activity.

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 ☐**

Student work evidences an understanding of architectural materials and assemblies in relation to performance, durability and environmental impact. The evidence is found in courses ASC202, 302, 521, and 523.

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 ☐**

Evidence that students understand the principles of structural behavior and the selection and application of appropriate structural systems was found in courses ASC 203, 303, and CVL 407.

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 ☐**

ASC 620, 623, and 302 provide evidence that students demonstrate an understanding of basic principles of building envelop systems including fundamental performance, aesthetics, durability, energy, material resources, and environmental impact.

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 ☐**
Courses ASC 200, 302, 402, and 521 provide evidence that students have an understanding of exterior envelope systems, thermal performance and thermal comfort in terms of objectives, regulatory framework and sustainability.

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 team reviewed the suite of courses noted in the APR as offering the required evidence for the fulfillment of this criterion. Specifically, the team reviewed ASC 620, 623, 622, 621, 523, 522, 521 and 520.

The team acknowledges the excellent suite of technical courses aligned with the two-term Comprehensive Studio delivery. In some instances, the technical content is successfully integrate into the design work. For example, there is strong evidence of student work in ASC 623, Principles of Detailing, directly influencing the design work in ASC 620. However, there is a lack of integration of some of the required knowledge sets within the design of the studio project.

The team observed that the integration of environmental systems and accessible design is not universally integrated in all the student work. Both high and low pass work at times reference certain aspects of environmental systems and accessible design but not in a manner that evidences full integration within the project's concept. There is also evidence of non-compliance with other key 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 ☐**

Courses ASC 102, 304, 622 and seminar work AR 8104 show evidence that students have an understanding of the profession and its regulatory framework though assessment of the responsibilities of the Architect.

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 team found evidence presented in the course work ASC 102, 522 and AR8102 that indicates the students are achieving the required level of 'understanding' for this SPC.

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 ☐**

Students demonstrate the ability to understand the basic principles of practice organization through a series of quizzes in ARC 103, 304, 522, and 622. Further evidence to demonstrate understanding can be found in AR8102 and 8104 seminars and group work where students apply these principles to their own test practices.

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 ☐**

Students demonstrate an understanding of contracts through the courses ASC 102, 304, 522, 622 and AR 8104. ASC 622 in particular has a focus on coordination with allied disciplines and Construction Contracts.

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 team is satisfied with the evidence presented in the course work ASC102, 304, 522 and AR8104 that the students are achieving the required level of 'understanding' of Project Management.

IV. Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

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

1- Brief History of the Institution

Established in 1948, the Ryerson Institute of Technology (RIT) was part of an ambitious educational experiment created in response to social and technological changes sweeping society after World War II. The institution originally occupied the century-old buildings of the Toronto Normal School (est. 1847) in historic St. James Square, which was Ontario's first teacher-training facility – also a museum, art school, and agricultural laboratory, which enhanced the Square's reputation as Ontario's cradle of education. TMU provides an online overview of institutional history. Highlights are listed here:

- 1948 Ryerson Institute of Technology opens with course and diploma offerings in a variety of areas, including architectural drafting, business, costume design, electronics, food technology, furniture crafts, industrial and mechanical technology, photography, graphic arts, jewellery and horology.
- 1963 Ryerson Polytechnical Institute – name changed to Polytechnic following significant growth and provincial approval for a board of governors, enabling reorganization and self-determination. A significant building program followed with development of new facilities and academic policies.
- 1971 Degree-granting authority – programs shift from 2 and 3-year diplomas to 4-year degrees.
- 1993 Ryerson Polytechnic University – full university status gained.
- 2002 Ryerson University – renamed to reflect its full-fledged university status and mandate to grant graduate degrees and engage in advanced research. A new period of building growth follows, with new construction, visionary renovations and urban development, including several significant architectural projects by regional and international designers.
- 2020 Launches a new Lincoln Alexander School of Law.
- 2022 Toronto Metropolitan University – institutional name change symbolizing its commitment to urban excellence and inclusion, and recognizing concerns about Egerton Ryerson's influence on the Canadian Indian residential school system. For more on this change and move toward truth and reconciliation, see TMU's Next Chapter and results of the Standing Strong Task Force.
- 2025 Launches a new School of Medicine in Brampton.

2- Institutional Mission

Named for Egerton Ryerson (1803-1882), celebrated at the time as founder of Ontario's educational system, the RIT institutional vision was developed under the guidance of its first principal, Howard Kerr. Modelled in relation to MIT, Kerr envisioned an institution that would

serve its larger community through applied education. Its motto, Mente et Artificio (with mind and skill), signified the dual goals of training students for specific careers while also educating citizens to be informed and meaningful contributors to society. Guided by Kerr, RIT matured into an institution with a curriculum that increasingly emphasized humanities and innovation, hallmarks that would distinguish Ryerson from other vocational institutions.

3- Program History

Architectural studies was a founding program of the institution in 1948. Since then, it has evolved and expanded, while reinforcing its core mission to prepare career-ready graduates with the technical skills and cultural knowledge they need to solve real-world challenges and act as wise and effective leaders. In fall 2024, DAS celebrated its 75+ year anniversary, with an exhibition event, featuring a timeline of program milestones informed by archival research, a large dynamic model of the architecture building, and presentations by alumni spanning six decades. See the online version of this DAS Bash exhibition (with timeline), and the Canadian Architect review. Highlights from the program history are below.

- 1948 School of Architectural Draughting opens, offering 2-year Diploma in Architectural Draughting
- 1951 Name changes to School of Architectural Technology, introduces a 3-year Diploma in Architectural Technology.
- 1953 Architecture and Building Technology introduced as third year option studies.
- 1957 Construction Technology option introduced (discontinued in 1959).
- 1973 Architectural Science is introduced as a four-year Bachelor of Technology degree – with two common foundation years and two years of specialized study in Architecture, Building Science, or Project Management. This development followed TMU's new status as a degree-granting institution, expanding programs from two- and three-year diplomas to four-year degrees.
- 1981 Architecture Building opens at 325 Church St., designed by Thom Partnership (Ron Thom). The program was previously in the original Normal School/Ryerson Hall, 1948-63 (demolished); the old Pharmacy Building at 33 Gerrard, 1964-69 (now TMU's Centre for Urban Innovation); the City Hall Annex at 426 Bay St, 1969-77 (destroyed by fire); and temporary space at 720 King St. West, 1977-1981.
- 1982 Gains status as a Department of Architectural Science and Landscape Architecture – reflecting landscape studies, which had been offered since at least 1970.
- 1991 The Department becomes part of the Faculty of Engineering and Applied Science (FEAS), previously in a Faculty of Technology (1983-91), and Technology and Arts Divisions earlier.
- 1993 University status - the institution achieves full university status with a renewed emphasis on research; the gradual introduction of graduate programs follows.
- 2002 Department of Architectural Science – reflecting discontinuance of landscape architecture.
- 2007 Master of Architecture Program admits its inaugural class.
- 2008 Graduate program in Building Science introduced.

- 2008 CACB Candidacy status earned for the Architecture Program.
- 2010 CACB full accreditation earned for the Architecture Program.
- 2012 Faculty of Engineering & Architectural Science (FEAS) – faculty renamed with Science becoming its own Faculty (was Faculty of Engineering, Architecture and Science, 2006-12)
- 2014 Architectural Science Cooperative Education Internship (ASCEI) added, with up to 4 work terms (16-months) following third year. Initially available to 16 students, expanded to 32 in 2018.
- 2022 Bachelor of Architectural Science Honours – honours degree designation earned.
- 2022 Graduate program in Project Management in the Built Environment introduced.
- 2024 Launch of PhD in Architecture.

4- Program Mission

The DAS mission statement was refined and approved on May 12, 2025.

- Deliver high-quality programs that equip graduates for success by integrating architecture, building science, and project management, and providing exceptional collaborative and experiential learning opportunities.
- Prepare forward-thinking professionals for effective leadership roles in the Architecture, Engineering and Construction (AEC) industry and related fields by cultivating critical thinking, creative innovation, and interdisciplinary engagement with diverse contexts.
- Champion an integrated and adaptive approach to architecture as a social, technical, environmental, political, and culturally responsive practice that addresses complex global challenges and evolving societal needs.
- Cultivate an inclusive environment of diverse perspectives and scholarly, research and creative activities, wherein everyone is respected and enabled to thrive.

5- Program Action Plan

The Architecture Program action plan builds on institutional priorities noted above and follows the specific recommendations arising from the 2024-2025 PPR self-analysis process for the BArchSc and MArch programs. These recommendations outline planned actions for specific courses, curricular improvements, extracurricular activities, human resources, and physical resources. The 21 recommendations – 12 for the undergraduate BArchSc program and 9 for the MArch graduate program – are provided with rationale in Appendix 1.2.1 and 1.2.2 of the Program APR. The recommendations are also included in the full PPR self-study reports, (available in Appendix 3.1.1 and 3.1.2), with monitoring and assessment plans. Detailed implementation plans will be completed following the PPR site visits in fall 2025. The following summarizes and harmonizes the 21 recommended actions in ways that resonate for all of DAS.

People & Community

- Advocate for university investment in human resources (faculty and staff) to support program needs, objectives, growth and recruitment

- Recruit new faculty and develop succession planning to replace departures
- Create a full-time Indigenous faculty position
- Ensure adequate staffing to enhance student services and administration support
- Attract and retain outstanding students

Teaching & Learning

- Refine courses and curriculum in alignment with PPR recommendations to enhance student success and advance DAS program objectives
- Strengthen experiential learning opportunities to ensure ongoing excellence and equitable access
- Support teaching excellence to enhance students' learning experience with resources, including continued teaching assistance and supports

Research (SRC)

- Showcase SRC excellence and diverse research activities
- Support research development and equitable workloads
- Advance interdisciplinary and cross-sector collaborations
- Foster PhD program growth, recruitment and synergies amid DAS programs

Engagement

- Sustain global mobility programs and regional excursions
- Expand Indigenous partnerships in support of advancing Truth and Reconciliation and Indigenous curriculum development
- Continue outstanding professional, industry and community engagement
- Increase youth outreach programs for recruitment

Facilities

- Advocate for internal and external investment in the renovation and expansion of the Architecture Building
- Extend capacity of the workshop facilities, labs and studios with enhanced space and equipment
- Exemplify sustainable leadership in lab practices and resource management

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

MEMBERS OF THE VISITING TEAM	
VOTING MEMBERS	**NON-VOTING MEMBERS**
Marc Boutin Educator marc@the-mbac.ca	**Peter Sealey** Educator peter.sealy@daniels.utoronto.ca
Katherine Wagner Educator KWagner@designdialog.ca	**Asim Mazhar** Practitioner asimm@metafor.studio
Ron Christopher Adriano Practitioner ronc.adriano@gmail.com	**Rob Bateman** Practitioner rob.bateman@stantec.com
Brent Stewart Practitioner brents@goguenarch.com	**Shelagh McCartney** Educator shelagh.mccartney@torontomu.ca
Christopher Johnson Intern johnson.christopher1404@gmail.com	

Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

Virtual Pre-Visit Planning

Pre-Meeting **Monday, January 12th** **11:00AM – 12:00PM 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 **Friday, January 16th** **12:00PM – 1:00PM 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 **Thursday, January 22nd** **12:30PM – 1:30PM 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 **Thursday, January 29th** **2:00PM – 3:00PM 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
Tuesday, February 17th
1:00PM – 3:00PM 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
	• The Team develops a draft VTR
	• Entrance meeting with Librarian
	  ○ Mark Robertson
	  ▪ Dean of Libraries; mark.robertson@torontomu.ca
	  ○ MJ Suhonos
	  ▪ Architecture Subject Matter Librarian; mjsuhonos@torontomu.ca

The Visit

Thursday **February 26th** (Virtual)		• Team Deliberations and Launch of draft VTR
Friday **February 27th**	**AM**	• 10:00AM: Entrance meeting with the FEAS Dean & Associate Dean ○ Sri Krishnan

(Virtual)		▪ Dean; krishnan@torontomu.ca o Dimitri Androutsos ▪ Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs and Student Affairs; dimitri@torontomu.ca • 11:00AM: Entrance Meeting with TMU Provost & Vice-President, Academic o Roberta Iannacito-Provenzano ▪ Provost & Vice-President Academic; roberta@torontomu.ca • 12:00PM: Entrance Meeting with the Program Head o Lisa Landrum ▪ Department Chair (Program Head); lisa.landrum@torontomu.ca
	PM	• Review of General Studies, Electives, and Related Programs • Continued Review of Exhibits and Records • Continued Team Deliberations and Drafts of VTR
Saturday February 28th	Travel Day	
Sunday March 1st (On-Site)	**AM**	• Visiting Team Arrival and Hotel Check-In o Pantages Hotel; 200 Victoria St, Toronto, ON M5B 2R3 • 12:00PM: Visiting Team Introductions and Orientation o Abrielle ▪ 355 King St W
	PM	• 2:00PM: Introduction Meeting with Program Head o Church Street Entrance to ARC Building (ARC205; ARC206) • 3:00PM: Tour of Facilities o 200 level > 100 level & workshop > 4th fl. Y1 & 2 > 3rd fl. Y3 & 4 > 2nd fl. MArch • 4:30PM: Team Debriefing Session o ARC205; ARC206 • 5:00PM: Team-only Dinner o Terroni ▪ 57 Adelaide St E. • 6:00PM – 11:00PM: Team Working Session: Development of Draft VTR o Pantages Hotel Meeting Room – Drama 4
Monday March 2nd (On-Site)	**AM**	• 8:30AM – 9:45AM: Team Working Breakfast with Program Head o Pantages Hotel Restaurant • 10:00AM – 11:00AM: Team Meeting with Staff o ARC206 • 11:00AM – 12:00PM: Observation of Studios o ASC201, ASC401, AR8103 (UG years 1 & 2; and MArch years 1 & 2) o ARC400; ARC200; ARC205
	PM	• 12:00PM – 1:00PM: Entrance Meeting with Faculty

		○ ARC200A • 1:00PM – 2:00PM: Lunch Meeting with the Student Representatives ○ ARC206 ▪ Pumpernickel's Catering ▪ 16 DAS Student Representatives • 2:00PM – 3:00PM: Working Session ○ ARC205 • 3:00PM – 4:00PM: Entrance Meeting with Students ○ ARC202 'PIT' • 4:00PM – 4:45PM: Team Debrief ○ ARC205 • 5:00PM EST: Team-only Dinner ○ Bosk - Shangri-La ▪ 188 University Ave, Toronto, ON M5H 0A3 • 6:00PM – 11:00PM EST: Team Working Session: Debriefing, Draft of VTR, Strengths and Causes of Concern ○ Pantages Hotel Meeting Room – Drama 4
Tuesday March 3th (On-Site)	**AM**	• 8:30AM: Team Breakfast with the Program Head ○ Pantages Hotel Restaurant • Follow-up Meeting (with Faculty, Students, Director, and Staff, as needed) • 10:00AM – 12:00PM: Team Lunch & Final Team Deliberations and Vote ○ ARC205 ▪ Miznon Catering
	PM	• 12:00PM: Exit Meeting with Program Head ○ ARC205 ▪ Lisa Landrum; Department Chair (Program Head) • 1:00PM: Exit Meeting with Provost & Vice-President Academic ○ ARC205 ▪ Roberta Iannacito-Provenzano; Provost & Vice-President Academic • 2:00PM: Exit Meeting with the Dean ○ ARC205 ▪ Sri Krishnan; Dean ▪ Dimitri Androutsos; Associate Dean, Undergraduate Programs and Student Affairs • 3:00PM: Team Debrief and VTR Working Session ○ ARC205 • 5:15PM: Team-only Dinner ○ Lucie ▪ 100 Yonge St • Check Out from the Hotel and Travel Home at their Leisure

V. Report Signatures

DocuSigned by:
Marc Boutin
F33790503D964B7...

Marc Boutin
representing the Educators

Signed by:
Katherine Wagner
2CB7D9C7714D4B8...

Katherine Wagner
representing the Educators

Signed by:
B1A2556509EB428...

Ron Christopher Adriano
representing the Practitioners

Signed by:
Brent Stewart
31D466C183434E7...

Brent Stewart
representing the Practitioners

Signed by:
Christopher Johnson
87C1F7B590E447C...

Christopher Johnson
representing the Interns

Signed by:
Peter Sealy
AEC0A621FE414AD...

Peter Sealey
CACB Non-Voting Member

Signed by:
Asim Mazhar
DF5F8410DA5C490...

Asim Mazhar
CACB Non-Voting Member

Signed by:
Rob Bateman
CDE9174E2758486...

Rob Bateman
CACB Non-Voting Member

Signed by:
3DC59F5DD326407...

Shelagh McCartney
Program Non-Voting Member