CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL CERTIFICATION BOARD

CONSEIL CANADIEN DE CERTIFICATION EN ARCHITECTURE

2026 Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture Program. M.Arch

Institution: University of Toronto

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 16
5. Causes of Concern and Team's Recommendations 18

III. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation 21

IV. Appendices 37

Appendix A: Program Information 37
Appendix B: The Visiting Team (Names & Contact Information) 39
Appendix C: The Visit Agenda 40

V. Report Signatures 43

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 (VT) reviewed the Master of Architecture (MArch) program (3-year and 2-year Advanced Standing track) of the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design (Daniels) at the University of Toronto (UofT). The visit was conducted according to the 2017 CACB Conditions and Terms for Accreditation and the 2017 CACB Procedures for Accreditation (Revised Edition, July 2025), using the hybrid visit model with virtual student exhibition (shared in February 2026) and entrance meetings (March 26th and 27th), followed by onsite meetings with faculty, staff, and students (March 29th to March 31st).

The VT thanks Vivian Lee, Program Director of the Master Architecture, Christopher L. Jones, Manager, Academic Programs, and the Program's dedicated faculty and staff team, as well as the student body for their warm welcome.

All meetings took place as planned, with generous and open exchanges helpfully complementing the detailed report prepared by the Program. Additional meetings were held with Trina Moyan, First Peoples Advisor, and Jewel Amoah, Assistant Dean of Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion.

In addition to the report, the VT requested, and received, before and during the visit, supplementary information about the academic planning process, the Professional Expense Reimbursement Allowance, teaching distribution across the Daniels faculty members, faculty hires since the undergraduate Architectural Studies program was integrated into Daniels, Advanced Standing review, graduation and retention rates, self-assessment surveys, research assistantships, scholarships and work study positions, as well as ratios of students in the Program having graduated from the UofT Bachelor of Arts, Architectural Studies.

The VT examined the Advanced Standing eligibility criteria and curriculum and is confident that students completing the Advanced Standing 2-year track achieve the same level of training as 3-year track students. Taking into account the two-track structure of the program, the VT focused on courses taken by both 3-year and 2-year tracks students, using first year course as evidence only in cases where student performance achievement could not be found in second and third years courses completed by students in both tracks.

The VT acknowledges that this visit comes at the end of a cycle heavily impacted by COVID and recent uncertainty around leadership, with an interim, then acting, Dean with limited authority for planning decisions. In this context, some concerns presented in this VTR should have already been addressed under normal conditions, but are instead still being dealt with or are on hold.

The Program sent on May 12, 2026 a detailed response to the draft report. This response (see final section of the report, p.44) did not cover any factual errors that could impact the original assessment by the VT. An additional sentence was added to SPC C5 to clarify the assessment following the Program's response.

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)

Cause of Concern 1 from the 2019 VTR: The studio space and working conditions appear inadequate. The team encourages that a reassessment of the design studio, in consultation with the students, be considered.

Program Response: Improvements continue to be made to the space to support the student experience and cultivate connections within the studio. Space allocation has been further modified this past year to better manage the noise level of certain studios. The newly allocated shared model-making area near the elevator bay allows students to engage in model-building in a space that is more conducive to social exchanges and potentially higher noise levels with some acoustic separation. Although model-making happens everywhere, higher noise-generating work is now separated from the main studio space. Furthermore, movable pin-up dividers with acoustic baffling perform double-duty by expanding pin-up wall space and offering further sound partitioning. Additional storage solutions have been both purchased and installed. "Freecycling" stations have been improved and continue to see an increase in use – reducing both costs and waste. This successful initiative has become part of the school's culture and a popular amenity for students. In addition to the existing ergonomic seating available in the studio, specialized chairs were made available to students demonstrating accessibility needs. Sit-stand desks were also offered to students demonstrating need. New desks are being purchased, with vertical pin-up panels, horizontal shelving, and better under-desk storage. This will create acoustic separation, individual pin-up space, and individual model storage space, which have not existed before, and will meaningfully improve studio experience. Finally, it is worth mentioning that the school has 2 full-time, dedicated studio technologists, who are available to assist students and ensure that the studio is safe and suitable for all the design and production requirements of the various courses. They run a materials and tools library and coach the students in safe model-making practices. They ensure that the spaces are well- organized, appropriately used and accessible to students, faculty and staff of all ages and abilities.

2026 Visiting Team Assessment: Many issues reported in the 2019 VTR are still present, most importantly regarding noise. Improvements have been slowed down by COVID remote conditions and uncertainty at the Daniels leadership level. However, changes have been made over the last year and other elements could be improved with better optimization of the spaces available. See Condition 6 for more details.

Cause of Concern 2 from the 2019 VTR: The access to the workshop assembly room associated with the shop appears insufficient given the modeling and production demands of the program. Additionally, students noted that the Photography Studio was relegated to a small room with poor ventilation.

Program Response: The workshop and assembly room continue to be improved based on evolving needs. The space has been reorganized, including electrical outlets now suspended over workstations, eliminating tripping hazards and safety concerns. Improved labelling, booking and signing out of materials continues to be refined. More woodshop tools have been added to the sign-out shop to increase access. Designated project storage racks free up workbench space to allow increased access. Dedicated assembly spaces have also been made within the studio to increase the capacity for this activity. Students must attend Orientation training led by Shop Staff, which highlights amenities and communicates important safety information. Dedicated Staff are scheduled to monitor the space and support students during operational hours. The technologists are in close contact with the course instructors, and are aware of upcoming projects, so they can provide specific support, materials and appropriate assembly spaces. Extended hours have also been rolled out during peak times throughout the semesters. The Photography Studio has been improved with additional equipment to support student activities, much like the assembly room improvements listed above. In addition, portable lights and other photography equipment can be signed out and taken to other parts of the building, reducing the demand on room usage.

2026 Visiting Team Assessment: This has been successfully addressed.

Cause of Concern 3 from the 2019 VTR: There are concerns about advanced placement policies. The team encourages a reassessment of current policies, procedures and protocols.

Program Response: The advanced standing option in our Master of Architecture program is offered to applicants who demonstrated advanced capabilities, as determined through a review of academic background and design portfolio. Applicants must submit an AP Eligibility Summary form (see section 3.10) that attests to the completion of the equivalency of four design studio courses, and one course each in design technology, structures, building science, and environmental systems. Meeting the minimum requirements for advanced standing does not guarantee placement. Applicants continue to be vetted in two stages, with an initial committee composed of faculty members representing the various areas of teaching and learning in the Master of Architecture program that puts forward eligible candidates for advanced placement consideration and moves the remainder into consideration for the three-year program. A second committee comprised of faculty teaching in the core courses of the second year of the program then reviews the presorted cohort to determine offers of admission and candidates are either admitted, reconsidered for the three-year program, or rejected. Since implementing this process in the 2022 admissions cycle, the number of applications considered for advanced placement has remained relatively consistent, as have our offers and yield of incoming students to the second year of the Master of Architecture program. Graduate

Admissions provides the admissions committee, typically made up of the program director and faculty, the advanced standing applications and data. The committee will first determine if the course requirements to apply for advanced standing have been met by an applicant. If they have met, the committee then reviews the application to determine if the applicant will be granted advanced standing admission. If they have not met the requirement for advanced standing or if the committee does not feel they are strong enough for another reason, even if the required courses have been completed, the applicant would be reviewed for the standard 3-year MARC*. The standard MARC committee meeting is a separate meeting, usually with more faculty present. The advanced standing course completion requirements to apply are outlined in the APR and on the Program's website.

2026 Visiting Team Assessment: This has been successfully addressed.

Cause of Concern 4 from the 2019 VTR: Of concern, and surprising given the strong administrative support in the Registrar's Office, is that some students feel that mental health support was not visible.

Program Response: The University of Toronto and the Daniels Faculty continue to recognize the importance of this topic and dedicate energy and resources to support our students. The additions noted in the last annual report have continued to have a positive impact on the student body, especially the same day or next-day access to services. The Daniels Faculty recently introduced additional mental health resources and supports within the Orientation programming, New Student Handbook, and the annual Resources Fair. The School of Graduate Studies (SGS) Presidential & Provostial Task Force on Student Mental Health Reports and Recommendations continue to be implemented and built upon, in particular addressing feedback on academic stress for students. Additional tools have been developed and shared with the student body, including a toolkit for students/supervisors on conflict resolution, and mentorship programs among other services. Recognizing that it has been a difficult few years for many, both locally and globally, with issues of geopolitics, climate, environment, health, housing, food security, labour and economics weighing more heavily on many of our students, it was and continues to be especially important to offer our community opportunities to rest, reflect and rejuvenate. The Daniels Faculty Assistant Dean, EDI, communicated regularly with the students throughout the school year regarding mental health supports [the list is provided in the APR on page 10]. At Daniels, we are deeply committed to supporting our students' academic progress and overall well-being. In addition to our Associate Registrar, Academic Advising and Student Engagement, Tanya Hyland, and our Academic Advisor, Sarah Harden, both of whom meet daily with students across all programs, we also have a dedicated team of front-line staff who have completed, among other things, Identify, Assist, Refer (IAR) training. This asynchronous online training equips staff with

the skills and knowledge to support individuals experiencing a range of challenges that may impact their mental health. Importantly, The Office of the Registrar at Daniels has partnered with the U of T Health & Wellness Centre to offer on-site counselling services specifically for our students. We currently have a designated Wellness Counsellor who provides free, confidential support. Students can book an appointment by calling 416-978-8030 (option 5) and asking to meet with the "Daniels Faculty counsellor," who is located at New College (40 Willcocks Street). In addition to this, same-day and next-day counselling appointments are available through the broader Health & Wellness Centre, with follow-up sessions booked either directly with the counsellor or through the Centre. We actively promote all of these services through both online and in-person channels, including the Daniels Faculty website, brochures, postcards, and buttons displayed in our Student Services Office, to ensure that students are fully informed and feel comfortable accessing support when needed.

2026 Visiting Team Assessment: Students mention being aware of services offered. The Assistant Dean, EDI and the First Peoples Leadership Advisory Group appear to be particularly appreciated resources.

Cause of Concern 5 from the 2019 VTR: The Visiting Team noticed that ARC2014, the Comprehensive Design Studio in second year, is responsible for addressing 14 SPCs directly and supporting another 5 SPCs. It is noted that the previous VTR 2013 alluded to this as well.

Program Response: As shown in our most recent SPC matrix, the Comprehensive Studio is no longer the primary vehicle for addressing many of the Student Performance Criteria. While it continues to serve as a central point of integration between the Building Science sequence and a design studio, considerable effort has been made to embed additional moments of integration throughout the broader curriculum. This process began with a comprehensive curriculum review in 2021, during which the program established several MARC Faculty Working Groups to conduct a wide-ranging assessment. This initial phase identified redundancies, clarified learning objectives, and set priorities to enable more intentional and effective connections across courses. The 2024–25 Studio Curriculum Matrix [shown in the APR on pages 11-12] reflects the ongoing outcomes of this work and serves as a continuation of the efforts initiated by the Working Groups. In addition to strengthening connections between studios and other required core courses, we have deliberately aligned course content to reinforce integration across the curriculum. For example, ARC1022 Design Technology 1 supports ARC1011 Architectural Design Studio 1 by developing students' skills in digital and physical model-making. ARC2023 Design Technology 2 and ARC2047 Building Science 3: Environmental Systems work in tandem to deliver key concepts in environmental controls, alongside the software tools used to evaluate these systems. Similarly, ARC2042 Site Engineering and Ecology and ARC2023 Design Technology 2 introduce the functions of GIS software in a sequence that

culminates in its application within ARC2013 Architectural Design Studio 3: Integrated Urbanism Studio. As outlined in the latest SPC descriptions, we have also implemented targeted reforms within specific subject areas. Notably, three of the four Building Science courses now include dedicated one-hour labs that directly link building science knowledge to design-based assignments. The History and Theory sequence has been reorganized around six thematic lenses, with an expanded focus on non-Western perspectives. Together, these curricular strategies ensure that all Student Learning Criteria are thoughtfully distributed across the first two years of the MARC Core Curriculum, providing students with a strong, integrated foundation before they progress into more specialized, student-chosen courses.

2026 Visiting Team Assessment: If ARC 2014 is still responsible for addressing 14 SPCs, all of these SPCs are also addressed by other courses and the revised curriculum better integrates SPC coverage across courses and studios. However, the VT remains concerned that the two-track structure of the program combined with the third year focused on option studios, electives, and thesis leaves the second year responsible for the achievement of a large majority of the SPCs, which seems disproportionately weighted. (Only 4 of the 19 A, B, C, and D SPCs are covered in the third year. All E SPCs, except for E2, are only covered in the third year.)

Condition Not Met from 2019 VTR: Condition 2. Public Information

Program Response: The required notification is included prominently in the official Master of Architecture entry in the University of Toronto School of Graduate Studies Academic Calendar: Architecture, Landscape, and Design | School of Graduate Studies (SGS) Calendar. This information, along with up-to-date details of program accreditation, is also provided on the official John H. Daniels Faculty website, linked within the MArch Program page here: https://www.daniels.utoronto.ca/program-accreditation-march. Additional accreditation information is embedded on the same pages, and linked here: https://www.daniels.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/guideforstudent.pdf; https://www.daniels.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/2019_final_vtr_u_of_toronto.pdf; https://www.daniels.utoronto.ca/sites/default/files/2019_accred-decision_uoft_1_pg.pdf

2026 Visiting Team Assessment: *This Condition is now met.*

Condition Not Met from 2019 VTR: PPC 3. Global Perspectives and Environmental Stewardship

Program Response: Daniels Faculty has deepened its commitment to engaging diverse cultural, social, and political contexts. This is reflected in recent faculty hires, expanded community outreach, and curriculum revisions that prioritize equity, inclusion, and global perspectives. Curricular changes include the restructuring of History and Theory courses

(ARC1031 and ARC1032), which foreground counter-narratives and challenge dominant historical accounts. ARC1031: Historical Perspectives on Topics in Architecture 1 introduces themes such as Indigeneity, settler colonialism, and tropical architectures, while ARC1032: Historical Perspectives on Topics in Architecture 2 examines architecture's role in systems of power, including mercantilism, colonialism, and capitalism. In ARC2017: Research Methods, students critically assess architectural research tools and the biases embedded within them. Across these courses, students are encouraged to center marginalized voices and question how architectural knowledge is produced and by whom. These critical frameworks extend into the design studio sequence. In ARC1012 Architectural Design Studio 2: Site, Matter, Ecology, and Indigenous Storywork, co-developed with Indigenous Knowledge Keeper James Bird, students explore Indigenous approaches to land, ecology, and materiality through a "Decolonized Museum" project that challenges colonial narratives. ARC2013 Architectural Design Studio 3: Integrated Urbanism continues cross disciplinary collaboration with landscape architects and urban designers, focusing on rapidly developing and gentrifying areas in the Greater Toronto Area. In ARC2014 Architectural Design Studio 4: Comprehensive Building Project, students work with West Neighborhood House to address housing, equity, and public health, engaging directly with community members to understand spatial justice through lived experience. The studio also incorporates a low-carbon, near net-zero design mandate, encouraging sustainable strategies alongside social impact. Global engagement is further supported through ARC3015 Option Studio and ARC2016 Summer Abroad, with recent travel-based coursework in Detroit, Zanzibar, Korea, Berlin, Greece, and Costa Rica. From an extracurricular perspective, the Daniels Faculty has implemented community engagement initiatives, such as Community for Belonging Reading Group, which is "intended to provide a platform for engagement, interaction and discussion". Details on this initiative, including topics and themes, are available in Section 3.3. – Equity, Diversity and Inclusion. Encompassing more than a Reading Group, Community for Belonging events have included walking tours, film screenings, theatrical performance and an exhibition. [The APR lists a series of programs and opportunities on pages 14 to 17: Public Program; Engage-Design-Build; Building Black Success through Design (BBSD); Building Indigenous Representation at Daniels (BIRD); Anti-Colonial Curriculum and Pedagogy Project; IDEAS Impact Award – Student Peer Recognition Initiatives.]

2026 Visiting Team Assessment: This Condition is now met.

Condition Not Met from 2019 VTR: A5. Site Context and Design

Program Response: Site Context and Design are explored across five core courses, spanning urban and non-urban conditions and engaging multiple scales of analysis. These courses incorporate advanced analytical tools that enable students to make

informed decisions regarding demographic analysis, ecological networks, and building orientation in relation to sunlight and wind patterns. At the largest urban scale, ARC2013 Architectural Design Studio 3: Integrated Urbanism Studio introduces students to GIS-based geospatial analysis as a foundation for informed design decision-making. Focusing on the redevelopment of the decommissioned Downsview Airstrip, the course emphasizes a thorough site analysis of demographic trends, ecological systems, infrastructure, and urban morphology. Design proposals are further enhanced through the simulate solar exposure and shadow patterns. These tools directly inform strategies for building orientation, daylighting, and energy efficiency. At a medium, non-urban scale, ARC1012 Architectural Design Studio 2: Site, Matter, Ecology, and Indigenous Storywork focuses on a rural site defined by steep topography, archaeological and geological features, and a culturally grounded understanding of place shaped by Indigenous knowledge. Through detailed site analysis, students examine the layered histories embedded in the landscape, study local flora and fauna, and assess the availability of regional materials. These investigations encourage alternative approaches to building that are deeply responsive to the land and its ecological and cultural context. Technical knowledge is further developed in ARC2042 Site Engineering and Ecology, where students learn practical strategies for working with the land. Topics include grading techniques, watershed and stormwater analysis, stormwater management systems, and surface material selection. The course emphasizes how buildings shape and responds to the physical and environmental conditions of a site. At the finest grain, ARC2014 Architectural Design Studio 4: Comprehensive Building Project challenges students with a prominent corner site in downtown Toronto. The complexity of this urban setting requires consideration of access routes, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, service logistics, and solar radiation. Students analyze the implications of a corner lot, including its street wall, sidewalks, and civic visibility, while balancing public engagement with private programmatic needs. These investigations immerse students in the intricate realities of architectural design within a dense metropolitan environment.

2026 Visiting Team Assessment: This Condition is still not met.

Condition Not Met from 2019 VTR: C5. Environmental Systems

Program Response: Since the last accreditation visit, several new full-time faculty appointments have enabled significant revisions to the Building Science sequence (ARC1041, ARC1043, ARC2047, ARC2048) and the Design Technology sequence (ARC1022, ARC2023). These courses now place stronger emphasis on sustainable construction and environmental resilience, while introducing computational methods that allow students to simulate and predict thermal performance and energy use under varying design conditions. Collectively, they highlight the expanding role of architects in addressing the climate crisis and equip students to develop integrated, sustainable

design solutions. These lessons are brought together in ARC2014 Architectural Design Studio 4: Comprehensive Building Project, where students develop near net zero energy projects. Each project includes a Thermal Performance Report as part of enclosure design and a Low Carbon Building Report demonstrating the integration of active and passive systems. For further details on these assignments, please refer to Section C5 of the Student Performance Criteria.

2026 Visiting Team Assessment: This Condition is still not met.

Condition Not Met from 2019 VTR: E5. Project Management

Program Response: Project management is addressed in the year-long Professional Practice sequence, ARC3051: Professional Practice 1 and ARC3052: Professional Practice 2. These courses introduce students to the core principles of project management within architectural practice. Students examine various project delivery methods and gain insight into the roles and responsibilities of key stakeholders. This foundation helps them understand how project management strategies shift depending on the delivery model. The curriculum also covers the phases of an architect's basic services, outlining the workflows, collaborators, and responsibilities associated with each stage. Topics such as quality assurance, professional standard of care, cost estimation, and risk evaluation are explored in the context of procurement and project execution. Students learn how to select consultants, assemble project teams, and manage interdisciplinary collaboration. Applied learning is emphasized through assignments. In ARC3051, students prepare a recommendation for a steering committee, comparing procurement strategies, evaluating risks, and calculating professional fees. In ARC3052, students evaluate a Design-Build competition, where they assess risks and opportunities, negotiate project scope, develop organizational charts, create project schedules, and perform detailed cost and fee analyses. These exercises challenge students to apply project management skills while navigating ethical, legal, and strategic complexities. Lecture content further reinforces these principles. For example, the fall term of ARC3051 includes sessions on consultant selection, team assembly, joint ventures, and architect-engineer collaboration. Case studies such as the Parks Canada Artifact Collection Facility provide real-world examples of inter-firm teaming strategies and contractual arrangements. Students also explore the structure and negotiation of formal consultant agreements, gaining practical insight into interdisciplinary project coordination.

2026 Visiting Team Assessment: This Condition is now met.

4. Program Strengths

The Program's position within the interdisciplinary Daniels Faculty remains a major strength, with many faculty teaching across both disciplines and programs, and students benefiting from facilitated access to courses in disciplines outside of architecture. The integration in recent years of disciplines such as Forestry has further supported the Daniels' vision of architectural education as embedded in a broad understanding of built and natural environments.

Recent initiatives such as the Community for Belonging Reading Group, Indigenous awareness sessions, the Indigenous studio, First Peoples Advisory Office, the revision of history and theory courses, or the Building Black Success through Design (BBSD) and Building Indigenous Representation at Daniels (BIRD) programs are evidence of a commitment by both leadership and many faculty members to create a more inclusive environment more representative of the diversity of people living in Toronto and in the wider Canadian context. Their focus on being welcoming both before and during studies at Daniels exemplify an understanding of equity, diversity, and inclusion as being needed both in the classroom and outside the classroom. Because these initiatives are contingent on funding, Daniels must secure long-term support to achieve meaningful change.

Despite governmental policies impacting the recruitment of international students in universities across Canada, Daniels remains in a strong financial position, with budgetary decisions strategically made to limit the impact on pedagogy. Daniels has successfully maintained a high number of faculty members, with many faculty teaching full-time to students that bring a diversity of practice and research experience to both studios and courses.

The continued international reputation of the Program is rightly viewed by the UofT administration as being of great importance to the University. The program benefits greatly from its situation in the core of Toronto, bringing with it a wide variety of case studies and access to a large number of professionals, its international network of alumni, and its capacity to attract emerging and experienced invited professors and reviewers.

Efforts made since the last visit to overhaul the Building Sciences stream, through both a revision its courses and the hiring of new professors, has led to a clear sequence of courses and a strong integration in studios.

The Program strongly encourages group work throughout its curriculum, helping students understand the importance of collaboration and of learning to work together.

Conceptual development is very strong throughout every course. Carefully rendered visual representations and schematics demonstrate critical thinking about how diverse approaches can express ideas about architecture, at every scale of development. This echoes a stated interest

from faculty and leadership to sustain the university's tradition of being at the forefront of thinking about digital tools, including AI, and to mobilize expertise in other faculties.

The VT was impressed by the spirit of exploration and innovation underlining the bottom-up approach to revising the curriculum and its structure in recent years. Discussions with the Program Director further showed how the faculty team is not hesitant to quickly pivot, revise, and continually adjust its curriculum after testing changes. Students, faculty, and staff all highlight how agile and flexible the Program Director has been in adjusting and improving the Program in recent years to better address emerging needs in pedagogy, practice, and student experience.

5. Causes of Concern and Team's Recommendations

The transformation of the MArch into a 3-year program has significantly compressed the curriculum. In the current structure of the program. Furthermore, Advanced Standing students miss out on important elements of the program offered in the first year, notably the Indigenous Studio and the core history and theory courses, where many discussions of cultural diversity and global perspectives occur. This, combined with a focus on options studios, electives and thesis in third year, means that a majority of SPCs need to be addressed during the second year. However, the VT is encouraged by faculty members' reports that curricular discussions are ongoing and that recent changes are continuously evaluated and adjusted.

The Daniels Faculty experienced much growth and many changes in recent years, beginning with the move to an award-winning new building shaped by the pedagogical focus of the program and the addition of new programs to the Faculty. Discussions with students, faculty, and staff suggest, however, that adjustments to this new size are still ongoing. While changes continue to be made to the use of studio spaces and other spaces, many people reported issues with how spaces are used and activated, highlighting problems in coordinating the space available and course requirements. Others noted a lack of optimization of uses, which leads for example to reviews being held in noisy spaces or models being stored precariously throughout studio spaces (see Condition 6). There also seems to be broken channels of communication between different groups. Staff, students, and faculty mentioned that they often don't know whom to address with their issues or ideas, or admitted to feeling that they don't have formal or informal channels to communicate with others.

Uncertainty regarding the Daniels leadership in recent years has led to greater autonomy for the MArch program, but has also created a long transitional period for staff and has delayed the development of a new Academic Plan and much-needed adjustments to the building. The lack of a shared vision has impacted the sense of community and feeling of a consistent direction. The arrival of a new dean will hopefully lead to greater stability and much-needed improvement to the buildings, as well as support for the Program's autonomy in continuing the curricular changes already made in response to the previous VTR, most importantly by fully integrating EDI and First Peoples thinking/philosophy.

Full-time teaching-stream faculty have a heavy teaching load that limits both their ability to properly do research and exploration (to inform their teaching) and their contact time with students. The important contribution of teaching-stream faculty is perceived by some faculty members, both in the teaching stream and in the research stream, as creating a two-tiered faculty body that impacts the professional development of teaching-stream faculty and, consequently, the quality of up-to-date knowledge transmitted to students.

The program encourages group work and collaboration in most courses and studios. However, the VT did not find consistent evidence of a deliberate assessment strategy to allow individual students to understand their progress regarding different specific learning criteria, also limiting the VT's work in assessing SPCs during this visit. Although students and faculty report an increase in the number of individual assignments over the last year, the VT is concerned that the current ratio of group work to individual work may still allow students to pass without achievement of all SPCs. The understanding by individual students of their learning of specific elements within studio group work is also made more difficult by the program's culture of not giving mid-term grades or rubric evaluation in studio which could point out less understood aspects of a project.

The Program can rely on a strong and motivated support staff team. However, in addition to the communication issues identified earlier, the VT is concerned that the low number of staff positions within Daniels limits opportunities for career development and advancement within the faculty, potentially leading to a continuation of the high turnover experienced in recent years and a loss of institutional memory that impacts student support. There is also a perception by many staff of limited opportunities to contribute to curriculum development and pedagogy, particularly for library and fabrication staff as well as First Peoples and equity, diversity, and inclusion teams, despite practical and experiential expertise that could complement theoretical knowledge brought by faculty members.. Again, this perceived lack of interest and involvement could lead to turnover and continued instability.

The VT is concerned that initiatives and resources around equity, diversity, and inclusion and First Peoples awareness and support are underused and that their impact on pedagogy is not consistent and depends of individual faculty members' interests.

The important changes made in recent years to the curriculum have led to meaningful changes in diversifying the topics taught and better integrating course and studio work. As these ongoing changes are assessed and adjusted, the VT recommends that the Program continues working on three areas:

- Regarding the history and theory sequence, the Program has moved away from traditional historical surveys to teach a more inclusive understanding of architectural histories. The Program is aware of some of the challenges associated with these changes and expects to continue exploring innovative ways of teaching more inclusively without impacting a comprehensive understanding of historical trajectories.
- In the building sciences sequence, the first step of better integrating course assignments and studio work is well underway, but a challenge remains to ensure that every student consistently achieves learning criteria.
- The professional practice sequence is strong and integrates critical thinking about regulations and practices, but the Program could gain from integrating some of this

knowledge in studio teaching, especially as the topics of many studios lend themselves to such critical reflection on practice.

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 of a multilevel self-assessment process comprised of three components is found in the APR:

1. Cyclical peer reviews as part of the University of Toronto Quality Assurance Process (UTQAP), by a committee of reviewers from peer academic institutions.
2. Daniels Faculty's Academic Planning process 5-year plan.
3. Local processes, including course evaluations, student and faculty feedback, survey

However, the process to define a current Academic Plan has been on hold while the previous dean was on medical leave and is expected to resume when a new dean is appointed in the summer of 2026.

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 ☐**

The required information is present on both the Academic Calendar page and the Daniels website.

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 ☐**

Not only does the Program conform to provincial and institutional policies listed in the APR, it adequately communicates available resources to the Daniels community and procedures have been put in place to support and promote EDI. Daniels has appointed a First Peoples Leadership Advisory Group as well as an Assistant Dean, EDI to help it achieve its EDI goals.

The VT applauds the Program for its efforts to respond to key EDI commitments, especially the launch of the 2023-2024 Anti-colonial Curriculum and Pedagogy Project. While some changes have been brought to core courses and studios alike, wider integration of EDI principles and indigenous world views into the curriculum and current pedagogical practices await the development of a new Academic Plan.

In concert with the First Peoples Leadership Advisory Group and the Assistant Dean, EDI, the Program has implemented innovative initiatives, notably BIRD and BBSD. However, the VT is concerned about the long-term sustainability of these much needed programs without strong institutional commitment in the form of financial and human resources. Furthermore, the Indigenous advisors and Assistant Dean clearly have key contributions to make to curricular and pedagogical developments and greater use of their offices would ensure that the Program incorporates more fully diverse perspectives and preoccupations into its operations and activities.

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 ☐**

The student body is generally diverse, contributing to a rich and inclusive academic environment. The program fosters a healthy and supportive learning atmosphere, with opportunities for cross-disciplinary engagement. The presence of a large, shared studio space further encourages collaboration, knowledge exchange, and peer learning across different faculties.

While some students encounter challenges, mental health and wellness resources are available, including access to counseling services and a 24-hour helpline, and students mention being aware of these resources.

The Program offers a range of guest lectures and design critiques featuring diverse professionals and community members, which provide valuable perspectives and constructive feedback. Nevertheless, there is a perceived gap in opportunities for students to meaningfully connect with practicing architects, particularly in relation to career development and

employment pathways. Strengthening professional networking opportunities and career guidance would be beneficial.
Additionally, Teaching Assistants, Research Assistant, and other work-study opportunities exist, but there is a lack of clarity regarding application processes and selection criteria. Improved transparency and communication around these roles would help ensure equitable access for students and ensure the perception of fairness. These opportunities have also been impacted in recent years by budgetary cuts.

5. Faculty and Staff Resources

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

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

The Program has a large faculty body, comprised of 28 tenured and tenure-track faculty, 27 full-time and part-time teaching stream faculty, and a varying number of sessionals. Most faculty teaching in the MArch program also teach in other programs, most importantly the undergraduate Bachelor of Architectural Studies and a recently created PhD program. Of the 55 tenured, tenure-track, and teaching stream faculty, 15 hold a PhD and 12 are licensed in Canada.
A full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty teaching load is expected to be 4 half courses and a full-time teaching stream faculty teaching load is expected to be 6 half courses. Feedback heard from both tenured/tenure-track and teaching stream faculty underline that 6 half courses in the context of architectural education is a heavy teaching load, as course content is regularly changed from year to year and that courses are only offered to one section every semester. Furthermore, most teaching stream faculty have a practice or research grants to support their teaching, limiting their contact time with students outside of class or studio and their coordination time with other faculty and staff. Some teaching stream faculty have the opportunity to use options studio to develop their research through student exploration.
The current Program Director, Vivian Lee, is a teaching stream faculty. The APR states that the director's estimated distribution of effort is "30% teaching, 10% research/professional development, 60% administration". However, the Program Director has in recent years often taught 4 half courses, thus more than 50% of the expected teaching load for a teaching stream faculty. Combined with her research/professional development time, this leaves less than the 50% of her time for program administration required by the CACB, unless she works more than expected hours.
The Program shares all staff (registrar and student services, technology and fabrication shops, programs management, and information technology) with the rest of the Daniels Faculty, in a structure similar to other units at UofT. The librarian and her staff report the Chief Librarian, but also have a relation to the Daniels Dean, with the Daniels librarian attending Faculty

Council and Core Faculty Meetings. Major changes to the structure of the Daniels staff team and uncertainty around the Dean position has led to much turnover in recent years. Many staff report not having many opportunities to be involved in curriculum or pedagogical discussions, with for example fabrication technologists and librarian very rarely being invited to contribute directly to pedagogical efforts.

6. Space and Technology Resources

The Program must provide physical resources that are appropriate for a professional degree program in architecture, including design studio space for the exclusive use of each full-time student, lecture and seminar spaces that accommodate a variety of learning modalities, office space for the exclusive use of each full-time faculty member, and related instructional support space. The Program must demonstrate that all students, faculty, and staff have convenient, equitable access to appropriate visual, digital, and fabrication resources that support professional education in architecture.

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

The Program offers appropriate and equitable physical and technological resources to support a professional architecture degree. Strengths include dedicated graduate studio space, a premium lecture hall, and exceptionally well-equipped fabrication facilities (laser cutting, CNC, robotics, 3D printing, and wood shop with construction and assembly areas). Access to advanced IT infrastructure, software, and technical support was clearly available.

However, students reported both space, storage and ventilation issues in the studio. Further, the complexities of the building's scheduling and space booking system do not always allow for dedicated formal review spaces, leaving some critique sessions to happen in common places which may promote visibility but can also be challenging to students' performance comfort levels. Reviews held in the vast open studio space or in hallways are made difficult by ambient noise and other disturbances.

The 2019 VTR reported planning upgrades to address student concerns; the 2026 APR and onsite visit presented some strides on an action plan, mock-ups for new furniture, and the addition of breakout spaces in the studio space. However, the VT is particularly worried that concerns stated in the previous VTR about the facilities (noise, furniture) have been heard again almost exactly word for word from students, faculty, and staff – and have been experienced first-hand by the VT – but have yet to be successfully addressed at the time of the visit.

Overall, Daniel's has impressive and renowned facilities that simply need to be optimized from a space planning and programming lens to make the needed adjustments.

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 library offers strong collections, research support, and a well-used study environment, all supported by the broader University of Toronto Libraries network. Collections are actively developed to meet evolving curricular needs (including emerging areas such as AI and digital design). The library's shift from a Daniels-managed unit to the central UTL system has improved funding and networks but created a more indirect path to advocate for staffing and resource needs. The current staffing composition (one professional librarian and one technician) is well below levels in comparable UofT graduate libraries. Additional issues include inadequate staff work areas and slow retrieval times for off-site materials despite mitigation strategies. While required documentation is provided and resources are strong, sustained investment in staffing and clearer planning mechanisms are needed to ensure equitable and convenient access to these resources.

8. Financial Resources

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

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

Ample evidence is provided in the APR, as well as in interviews with program, faculty, and university leadership, that the program is sufficiently funded, despite challenges related to international student recruitment and budget cuts facing all Canadian universities.

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 Program is housed within the Daniels Faculty, with MArch students making up approximately 13.6% of the Faculty's student body. Organizational charts in the APR show a similar degree of autonomy for the MArch program as other professional programs at UofT. The growth of Daniels combined with uncertainty at the faculty leadership level has led to increased autonomy for the Program Director to implement changes developed with other faculty members to better respond to CACB requirements. In discussions with students and faculty members, the VT observed that the Program Director steers the program in close

collaboration with other faculty members to nimbly adjust the curriculum and teaching environment to emerging student needs.

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 ☐**

Both the three-year Master of Architecture program and the two-year Advanced Standing option satisfy the Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CACB) requirements for accredited professional degree programs.

The Master of Architecture (3-year option) complies with CACB requirements for a program consisting of a minimum of six years of post-secondary education culminating in a Master of Architecture degree. This pathway requires a prior undergraduate degree in any discipline and includes a minimum of three years of professional architectural studies.

The Master of Architecture (2-year Advanced Standing option) complies with CACB requirements for a program consisting of a minimum of five years of post-secondary education culminating in a Master of Architecture degree. This pathway requires a recognized pre-professional undergraduate degree in architecture and incorporates advanced standing based on prior academic preparation. Admission to this option is described as very competitive by the program, with an average of only 28 students admitted each year.

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 APR outlines the School's strong and sustained approach to engaging with the profession and exposing students to a broad range of architectural roles, practice types, and career pathways. Strengths include extensive involvement of practicing architects, engineers, planners, and regulators in studio reviews, lectures, and construction site visits; all providing students with firsthand real-world experiences. Twelve of its faculty members are licensed in Canada, with others licensed in other countries.
The Professional Practice courses clearly address internship, licensure, and regulatory frameworks in Ontario. An annual networking event also allows for personal interaction and fosters job opportunities. The program does not provide internship placement support, but overall professional exposure is well-executed.

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 ☐**

After the MARC Faculty Working Groups conducted a broad assessment of the entire curriculum in 2021, the program has thoughtfully revised the course sequences so that all core studios are supported by technical or building sciences courses or both. Assignments are sometimes shared between studios and courses, helping students understand how to apply the knowledge learned in courses. Many faculty members, particularly in the teaching stream, also practice in parallel to their teaching, allowing for a deep engagement with contemporary design in the curriculum. This ensures that the social, technical, and professional streams are well woven together.

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 ☐**

As presented in the APR in its response to this cause of concern from the previous VTR, the Program has indeed experimented with curricular changes, encompassed a broader range of voices in its public programming, and implemented novel access and outreach towards underrepresented groups within professional architectural studies. Hiring of Indigenous faculty is planned, but not yet achieved. The VT notes that greater numbers of Black faculty would also need to be hired to truly reflect the diverse student population the Program hopes to attract.

The First Peoples Leadership Advisory Group as well as the Assistant Dean, EDI, teams are currently understaffed and underfunded, which limits the scope of work they can realistically accomplish. It is unfortunate since students really appreciate the initiatives these offices have been able to launch, and indeed their presence within the building. Furthermore, the BIRD and BBDS access and outreach programs, both great mentorship opportunities for students coming from diverse backgrounds, depend on limited grants, the latter of which has come to term. This jeopardizes long-term sustainability of these and other initiatives and, by ricochet, full integration of underrepresented populations into the student body and curricular and pedagogical reform.

PPC 4. Collaboration, Leadership, and Community Engagement

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

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

Evidence is found in APR, and in the Design Studio sequence ARC1011, ARC1012, ARC2013, ARC2014. The Program has demonstrated that collaborative practices, inclusivity and community engagement are all core elements of the curriculum. The VT commends the

Program on the development of the BBSD and the BIRD programs as crucial to fostering diversity, inclusivity, community engagement and empathetic approaches to design within the Program, offering important mentorship opportunities for students from underrepresented populations. As such, stable and ongoing funding for these initiatives is essential.
Group work is also strongly encouraged and part of many courses. However, the VT is concerned that collaborative skills are not explicitly taught in this highly collaborative context and that students are left to learn by themselves, sometimes in ways that appear detrimental to their learning. For example, some students report choosing to always cover similar aspects of group work, potentially limiting their ability to successfully explore and master all learning criteria.

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 VT acknowledges that a notable effort has been made to strengthen and sequence the Building Sciences stream since the last accreditation visit, creating a backbone curriculum that integrates BSI, structures, and elements of environmental performance. This, in tandem with the ARC2014 Comprehensive Studio, demonstrates the Program's engagement with both fundamental and emerging technical building construction.
Technical knowledge is found across multiple formats including coursework, analytical studies on design drawings, detailed technical drawings, and, with varied depth, physical detail models. Over the course of the program, the progression from first-year to third-year work reflects an appropriate trajectory of technical growth, particularly given the varied levels of incoming student experience associated with multiple admissions streams. At the same time, there is a noticeable range in the quality of student work between high-pass and low-pass work.
While the level of resolution observed generally meets, rather than exceeds, the expected competency, it is noted that students are engaging with novel materials/assemblies, likely with limited precedent documentation. This indicates a commitment to exploring emerging practices, even when such exploration introduces additional challenges in detailing. Further, the VT observed a high degree of Faculty involvement with substantial markups and redlines even on final presentation drawings underscores a culture of technical rigor and iterative improvement.

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

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

Evidence of both general and elective studies is found in the APR. Although the compression of the MARC program into a 2 or 3-year time frame poses an inherent challenge to the achievement of this criterion, Interdisciplinarity within core courses, as well as the wide selection of elective courses available, are sufficient to achieve a suitable breadth of education within the context of a Master of Architecture program requiring an undergraduate degree as a prerequisite.

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 is found in studios ARC2017, ARC2014, ARC2013, ARC3018, and ARC3021.

A2. Design Skills

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

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

Evidence is found in studios ARC2014, ARC2013, ARC1012, and ARC1011.

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 ☐**

Evidence is found in course ARC2023 and in all studios.

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 is found in the design studio sequence ARC1011, ARC1012, ARC2013, ARC2014, at progressively increasing degrees of complexity and at differing scales of project.

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 ☑**
Student work demonstrates that basic site characteristics (such as building outlines, streets, topography) are addressed across several courses; however, the analysis and its application remain fragmented and inconsistently integrated into design projects. Paired courses do not reliably align and the sequencing does not seem to support cumulative skill-building. Low-pass work frequently misidentifies contextual constraints or fails to translate analysis into design responses. While individual courses introduce the required analytical skills, the curriculum does not yet ensure that students synthesize these into responsive, informed design decisions.

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 ☐**
Evidence is found in studio ARC2013. However, there is limited evidence that environmental and ecological factors such as topography, hydrology, climate, and building orientation consistently inform design decisions, indicating an opportunity to better integrate these considerations alongside the urban design elements.

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 is found in coordinated coursework in ARC2014, ARC2048, and ARC2046. Students generally demonstrate an understanding of core building science principles, however, lower-pass work reveals inconsistencies in accurate representation and application. In some cases, technical rigor is compromised in favor of architectural expression, and the prevalence

of group work limits confidence that all students consistently demonstrate individual proficiency.

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 is found in studio ARC2014 and courses ARC2048 and ARC3052.

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 is found in studio ARC3021 and courses ARC2017 and ARC3018.

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 ☑**
Student work in ARC1031 and ARC1032 fail to demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the histories of architecture and urban design. The Team recognizes the significant efforts of the faculty to question the traditional survey of the canon by bringing alternative voices to bear on architectural and urban interpretation. However, examples of low pass student work show that students struggle to situate buildings, spaces, and ideas in their longer historical trajectories. Moreover, the syllabi provided suggests that only the 18th century through the end of the 20th century periods are covered by the curriculum. Elective courses are very specific to time and place, hence understanding is sporadic. No convincing evidence was found in studio ARC2013, indicated in the APR as covering this SPC.

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 course ARC2017. Student work in the History and Theory elective courses also demonstrate an understanding of architectural theories specific to each course's theme.

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 ☑**

While the Architectural History and Theory sequence ARC1031 and ARC1032 significantly opens up timely discussions about the production of knowledge and the power relations unwittingly embedded in the built environment, ARC1012 Studio 2 introduces students to Indigenous perspectives. Because advanced standing students start their studies at the beginning of second year, the position of these important courses in first year precludes one third of the cohort from being exposed to fundamental concepts and engaging experiences of cultural diversity and global perspectives and more crucially, the societal roles and responsibilities of architects. Moreover, nothing in the Advanced Standing Eligibility form checks whether these students have previously gained understanding of the elements covered by this SPC.

ARC2017 Research Methods and some elective courses and option studios address aspects cultural diversity and to some extant global perspectives through readings and thematic investigations, but achieving any understanding varies greatly as it depends on the personal interest of the student and of the instructor. ARC2014, the VT learned, is less concerned with engaging meaningfully with diverse cultural and social contexts than it is with sustainability and climate concerns. So even though the syllabus presented to the VT did allow students some interaction with vulnerable communities, this is not necessarily carried over to successive editions of the studio, making it difficult to ascertain the degree to which all students can "develop design responses that are informed by cultural sensitivity, social equity, and an awareness of the architect's responsibility to serve diverse communities."

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 is found in courses ARC1012, ARC2013, and ARC1041.

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 ☐**
Evidence is found in studio ARC2014 and course ARC2048.

C2. Materials
The student must have an understanding of the basic principles used in the appropriate selection and application of architectural materials as it relates to fundamental performance, aesthetics, durability, energy, resources, and environmental impact.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met ☑** **Not Met ☐**
Evidence is found in studio ARC2014 and course ARC2048.

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 is found in studio ARC 2014 and courses ARC1046 and ARC2046.

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 ☐**
Evidence is found in ARC1041, ARC1043, ARC2047, and ARC2048. However, a notable gap exists in the quality and resolution of envelope detailing between low-pass and high-pass submissions.

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 ☑**

Parts of this SPC are covered in courses ARC 2023 (passive environmental design strategies and evaluation modeling of impacts on thermal comfort and energy performance), ARC 2047 (introduction of active mechanical systems, and ARC 2048 (passive systems, thermal performance reporting and net-zero design strategies).
Despite this progression, engagement with active systems, including mechanical system fundamentals, and code integration remain limited within assignment requirements.
Student work demonstrates strong competency in analytical tools and environmental performance evaluation, but there is no evidence of engagement with NECB energy code analysis and its impact on building design.
Toronto Green Standard regulations are presented in ARC2047, but student work did not demonstrate an understanding of how these principles can be applied in buildings.

D. Comprehensive Design

D1. Comprehensive Design

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

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

Evidence is found in studio ARC2014. The VT notes, however, that a majority of the work submitted in the digital student exhibition for that studio is completed as group work, making it difficult to assess individual student work.

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 ☐**

Evidence is found in courses ARC3051 and ARC3052.

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 ☐**
Evidence is found in courses ARC3051 and ARC3052.

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 ☐**
Evidence is found in courses ARC3051 and ARC3052.

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 ☐**
Evidence is found in courses ARC3051 and ARC3052.

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 ☐**
Evidence is found in course ARC 3051 and ARC 3052. There is however limited evidence of structured assignments focused on the selection and evaluation of consultant teams, representing a key area for further development.

IV. Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

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

1- Brief History of the Institution

A brief history of the University of Toronto, along with its mission statement, are included as part of the Statement of Institutional Purpose, approved by the Governing Council of the University on October 19, 1992.

2- Institutional Mission

The University of Toronto is governed by the University of Toronto Act, 1971. The Act defines the composition of the Governing Council and its Executive Committee, and describes the powers of the Council.

3- Program History

A brief history of Architecture education at the University of Toronto and the John H. Daniels Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design is available on the Faculty's website: https://www.daniels.utoronto.ca/about/history

4- Program Mission

Given the Daniels Faculty's ongoing efforts to develop and finalize an Academic Plan – described more fully in Section 3.1 – the following mission statement has not yet been formally adopted through typical University governance processes. Once the Faculty's 5-year Academic Plan is published, the MARC program will commence reviews and planning of their own to align program missions and goals to the Faculty Academic Plan.

The MARC program's mission is twofold:

1. Advance the architectural discipline through research and innovation.
2. Provide a formative education to globally engaged individuals who will pursue professional opportunities in architecture and the civic art of building.

This mission reflects the Daniels Faculty's broader commitment to educating students, preparing professionals, and cultivating scholars who will play a leading role in creating more culturally engaged, ecologically sustainable, socially just, and artfully conceived environments.

5- Program Action Plan

The Daniels Faculty is developing a five-year Academic Plan to guide its strategic direction. This plan will align with university-wide initiatives and focus on truth and reconciliation, EDI, alumni engagement, and professional outreach. For the Master of Architecture program, this planning

process ensures alignment with broader institutional goals and supports its evolution in a changing academic landscape.

Completed: Consult with program leaders and design engagement processes.

Short Term: Finalize and submit Academic Plan to the Office of the Vice Provost, Academic Programs; align advancement strategies.

Medium Term: Disseminate plan and assess progress for future planning.

Long Term: Create comprehensive program evaluation processes and mechanisms that align program activities with the Faculty's and University's strategic plans.

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

MEMBERS OF THE VISITING TEAM

VOTING MEMBERS

Olivier Vallerand olivier.vallerand@umontreal.ca	Educator
Tania Martin tania.martin@arc.ulaval.ca	Educator
Meghan Lamb meghanlamb219@gmail.com	Practitioner
Andrew Wallace andrew@wkarch.ca	Practitioner
Kaamil Allah Baksh kaamil0127@gmail.com	Intern

Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

The Virtual Pre-Visit

Monday, February 9th (50 calendar days in advance) 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 9th** 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 **Wednesday, February 18th** 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 **Monday, March 2nd** 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, March 13th** 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

The Visit

Thursday March 26th (Virtual)		☐ 9:45-10:45am: Entrance Meeting with Nicholas Rule, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs o nicholas.rule@utoronto.ca ☐ Team Deliberations and Launch of draft VTR
Friday March 27th (Virtual)	**AM**	☐ 9:00-10:00am: Entrance meeting with the Program Head: o Vivian Lee, Director, Master of Architecture - Vivian.Lee@daniels.utoronto.ca ☐ 10:00-11:00am Entrance meeting with the school administrator(s): o Robert Levit, Acting Dean - robert.levit@daniels.utoronto.ca o EA: Daniels-dean@daniels.utoronto.ca o Brady Peters, Associate Dean, Academic - brady.peters@daniels.utoronto.ca

		○ Sean Thomas, Associate Dean, Research - sc.thomas@utoronto.ca ○ Jewel Amoah, Assistant Dean, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion - jewel.amoah@daniels.utoronto.ca ○ Trina Moyan, Indigenous Advisor ○ Susan Rodgers, Chief Administrative Officer - susan.rodgers@daniels.utoronto.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 28th	Day off (or Travel)	
Sunday March 29th (On-Site)	**PM**	☐ By 2:00pm - The Visiting Team's arrival and check-in at the hotel ☐ 2:00-2:30pm - Visiting Team introductions and orientation ☐ 2:30-3:30pm - Short Intro meeting with Program Head ○ Vivian Lee, Director, Master of Architecture ○ Christopher Jones, Manager, Academic Programs ☐ 3:30-4:30pm - Facilities Tour: Fob access, network access, logistics ☐ Team-only Dinner and Debriefing session and development of draft VTR
Monday March 30th (On-Site)	**AM**	☐ 8:00-9:00am - Team working breakfast with Program Head ○ Vivian Lee, Director, Master of Architecture ☐ 9:00-10:30am - Entrance meeting with faculty ☐ 10:45am – Library tour with Librarian - Cathryn Copper ☐ 11:15am-12:00pm - Observation of Lectures and Studios
	PM	☐ 12:00-1:00pm - Meeting with the Student Representatives (working lunch) ☐ 1:00-2:30pm - Entrance Meeting with MARC 1, 2, and 3 Students ☐ 2:30-3:30pm – Meeting with Staff ☐ Registrar Staff, Programs Office Staff, Digital Fabrication Lab Staff, Studio Staff, Workshop Staff, Facilities Staff ☐ 3:45pm – Indigenous Advisor Meeting – Trina Moyan ☐ 4:15-5:00pm - Observation of Lectures and Seminars ☐ Team-only dinner ☐ Debriefing session, re-draft of VTR and draft of Strengths and Causes of Concern
Tuesday March 31st (On-Site)	**AM**	☐ 9:00-9:30am - Team Breakfast with the Program head ○ Vivian Lee, Director, Master of Architecture ☐ 9:30am – Zoom meeting with Associate Dean - Equity, Diversity and Inclusion – Jewel Amoah ☐ 10:00am-12:00pm - Possible follow-up meeting (with Faculty, students, director, and staff, as needed)/ Team deliberations (working lunch)

	PM	☐ 12:00-12:30pm - Exit meeting with University President (or designate) and Provost o Nicholas Rule, Vice-Provost, Academic Programs ☐ 12:30-1:00pm - Exit meeting with Program Head o Vivian Lee, Director, Master of Architecture ☐ 1:00-1:30pm - Exit meeting with the school administrators ☐ Team Wrap-up and Departure

V. Report Signatures

Signed by:
FC0DC879F5B541B...

Olivier Vallerand
representing the Educators

Signé par :
35628EBB44A74A7...

Tania Martin
representing the Educators

Signed by:
1E239DF474844D2...

Meghan Lamb
representing the Practitioners

Signed by:
333D68F53A454D1...

Andrew Wallace
representing the Practitioners

Signed by:
866443A38FDB408...

Kaamil Allah Baksh
representing the Interns

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

Degree: Master of Architecture, M.Arch

March 29 – 31, 2026

Olivier Vallerand, CACB Visiting Team Chair
Mourad Mohand-Said, CACB Executive Director

May 12, 2026

Dear Olivier and Mourad,

We are deeply grateful for the time and care the Visiting Team took in reviewing our Architecture Program Report, and the collegial manner in which they conducted the on-site visit. Our faculty, students, and staff were very happy to welcome the whole team to the Daniels Faculty for this important review of our Master of Architecture program. We would also like to express our appreciation for the efforts of the CACB staff, who were very effective in organizing virtual meetings and coordinating with the Daniels team for on-site logistics.

It is deeply gratifying to see that the Visiting Team has identified program strengths that are the result of massive efforts on the part of the Daniels community to improve our efforts in equity, diversity, inclusion, and reconciliation; good stewardship of the Faculty's resources; and efforts to engage in continuous quality improvement within the curriculum.

The following responses to the VTR focus on the five conditions and Student Performance Criteria (SPC) assessed by the visiting team as "not met." In each case we have included a brief response that we hope will resolve any misunderstandings and bring additional context and clarity for the Visiting Team and the CACB in making their decisions and recommendations.

We look forward to receiving the final draft of the VTR and to reviewing the accreditation decision of the CACB.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
JOHN H. DANIELS FACULTY OF
ARCHITECTURE, LANDSCAPE, AND DESIGN

1 Spadina Crescent
Toronto, ON M5S 2J5
Canada
416-978-5038

5. Faculty and Staff Resources

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

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

The Program has a large faculty body, comprised of 28 tenured and tenure-track faculty, 27 full-time and part-time teaching stream faculty, and a varying number of sessionals. Most faculty teaching in the MArch program also teach in other programs, most importantly the undergraduate Bachelor of Architectural Studies and a recently created PhD program. Of the 55 tenured, tenure-track, and teaching stream faculty, 15 hold a PhD and 12 are licensed in Canada.

A full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty teaching load is expected to be 4 half courses and a full-time teaching stream faculty teaching load is expected to be 6 half courses. Feedback heard from both tenured/tenure-track and teaching stream faculty underline that 6 half courses in the context of architectural education is a heavy teaching load, as course content is regularly changed from year to year and that courses are only offered to one section every semester. Furthermore, most teaching stream faculty have a practice or research grants to support their teaching, limiting their contact time with students outside of class or studio and their coordination time with other faculty and staff. Some teaching stream faculty have the opportunity to use options studio to develop their research through student exploration.

The current Program Director, Vivian Lee, is a teaching stream faculty. The APR states that the director's estimated distribution of effort is "30% teaching, 10% research/professional development, 60% administration". However, the Program Director has in recent years often taught 4 half courses, thus more than 50% of the expected teaching load for a teaching stream faculty. Combined with her research/professional development time, this leaves less than the 50% of her time for program administration required by the CACB, unless she works more than expected hours.

The Program shares all staff (registrar and student services, technology and fabrication shops, programs management, and information technology) with the rest of the Daniels Faculty, in a structure similar to other units at UofT. The librarian and her staff report the Chief Librarian, but also have a relation to the Daniels Dean, with the Daniels librarian attending Faculty Council and Core Faculty Meetings. Major changes to the structure of the Daniels staff team and uncertainty around the Dean position has led to much turnover in recent years. Many staff report not having many opportunities to be involved in curriculum or pedagogical discussions, with for example fabrication technologists and librarian very rarely being invited to contribute directly to pedagogical efforts.

Program Response:

Teaching loads for full-time, appointed faculty members fall within a range of Full Course Equivalents (FCE), rather than a fixed number of semester-long half-courses. Full-time, tenure stream faculty members are assigned teaching that falls between 2.0 and 2.4 FCE. Full-time, teaching stream faculty members are assigned teaching between 3.0 and 3.4 FCE.

A single FCE is generally equivalent to a year-long course, taught weekly across two 12-week terms, and 0.5 FCE is generally a course taught within a single semester. Most semester-long courses are weighted at 0.5 FCE, but core studio courses are weighted at 0.625 FCE, even though the course takes place within a single semester. Other teaching-related duties, such as multi-section studio coordination and thesis supervision receive fractional FCE weighting, to ensure that teaching loads fall within the prescribed range for each appointment stream.

During the Program Director's first three-year appointment (2020-2023), teaching assignments were 1.375, 1.90, and 1.25 FCEs. Within the current three-year term (2024-2027), teaching assignments have totaled 1.125 for each of the last two years, acknowledging that the Program Director received an additional 0.5 FCE release in each year for Program Accreditation Preparation.

Workload Policy will be reviewed in the summer of 2027 when appropriate adjustments will be reviewed for course relief for director roles, particularly for directors holding teaching stream appointments. Adjustments to Workload Policy are set for three years and establish durable precedents in policy. In the meantime, appropriate adjustments to teaching load for the director of the Master of Architecture Program will be adjusted by the current dean.

A new continuing dean has been appointed by the Provost, with a 5-year term beginning July 1, 2026. While administrative staff departures have occurred for a variety of reasons in recent years, the staff complement has now stabilized.

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 ☑**

Student work demonstrates that basic site characteristics (such as building outlines, streets, topography) are addressed across several courses; however, the analysis and its application remain fragmented and inconsistently integrated into design projects. Paired courses do not reliably align and the sequencing does not seem to support cumulative skill building. Low pass work frequently misidentifies contextual constraints or fails to translate analysis into design responses. While individual courses introduce the required analytical skills, the curriculum does not yet ensure that students synthesize these into responsive, informed design

Program Response:

The criteria under review are addressed through a deliberately scaffolded sequence of three studios and three supporting technical courses, each building on the last. Evaluating these criteria requires looking across the full sequence; assessment of individual courses in isolation risks misreading developmental progress as programmatic gaps. If these concerns had been raised during the visit, we would have been able to walk the Team through the specific points of integration across the curriculum to demonstrate a robust inclusion site analysis and study in core courses.

1 Spadina Crescent
Toronto, ON M5S 2J5
Canada
416-978-5038

The site-related curriculum unfolds in three stages. In ARC1012 Design Studio 2, students engage a rural site through multi-scalar ecological mapping — investigating watershed, geology, topography, plant and animal ecologies, and community stakeholders. This research was compiled into a studio-wide manual and accompanied by invited guest lectures from practicing researchers and professionals; together, these directly informed a design project requiring integration of grading, solar orientation, and enclosure systems. ARC1043 Building Science 2 runs concurrently, providing foundational knowledge of passive and active environmental systems, with instructors from building science and site engineering participating in lectures and reviews to further embed technical site thinking within studio practice.

ARC2042 Site Engineering and Ecology follows, deepening students' technical command of siting, grading, and landscape impact. ARC2013 Design Studio 3 then extends these skills to the scale of urban morphology and master planning, supported by ARC2023 Design Technology 2, where students use ClimateStudio to evaluate building orientation, daylighting, solar access, and energy performance. GIS instruction woven across ARC2042 and ARC2023 builds the site analysis literacy students bring directly to bear in ARC2013. The sequence culminates in ARC2014 Design Studio 4, where students synthesize all prior learning through a complex urban corner site demanding full technical and environmental integration.

We continue to strengthen cross-course alignment. Over the past two years, the instructor of ARC2042 has delivered a guest lecture within ARC1012 introducing students to the fundamentals of topography and building siting, establishing early in the sequence the reciprocal relationships between architecture and landscape they will develop in greater technical depth in subsequent courses. In 2025-26, ARC1012 asks students to design a greenhouse, seed bank, and community gathering space. These programs were deliberately chosen to require engagement with a range of technical and environmental considerations: passive and active environmental systems, solar path and building orientation, topography including regrading and retaining strategies, enclosure systems and their tectonic, spatial, and programmatic implications, and the movement of water across the site.

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 ☑**

Student work in ARC1031 and ARC1032 fails to demonstrate a comprehensive understanding of the histories of architecture and urban design. The Team recognizes the significant efforts of the faculty to question the traditional survey of the canon by bringing alternative voices to bear on architectural and urban interpretation. However, examples of low pass student work show that students struggle to situate buildings, spaces, and ideas in their longer historical trajectories. Moreover, the syllabi provided suggests that only the 18th century through the end of the 20th century periods are covered by the curriculum. Elective courses are very specific to time and place, hence understanding is

1 Spadina Crescent
Toronto, ON M5S 2J5
Canada
416-978-5038

sporadic. No convincing evidence was found in studio ARC2013, indicated in the APR as covering this SPC.

Program Response:

It is true that two half-courses at an introductory level cannot deliver a comprehensive understanding of the histories of architecture and urban design over all time and space, but this criterion is not suggested anywhere in the language of the accreditation requirement. The criterion states that students must *have an understanding of the history of architecture and urban design*; the word "comprehensive" does not appear. Our interpretation of this requirement centers on method and argument rather than coverage: we seek to teach students how to think historically, so that the analytical and interpretive skills developed in ARC1031 and ARC1032 can be applied to any historical material they encounter in subsequent coursework, in practice, and throughout their careers following completion of the degree.

The Visiting Team's concern that only the period from the 18th century to the end of the 20th century is covered reflects a deliberate curricular decision. The construction of survey courses has become an increasingly fraught challenge in which questions of geographical scope, ethno/national traditions, high and low architectures and built form, and date range have all been subject to critical consideration by architecture schools and new generations of highly skilled research trained historians. In our effort to provide the necessary skills for and habits of historical inquiry ARC1031/1032 focuses on particular episodes in the long but necessarily limited history of architecture during a time-frame when the discipline became a charged medium for larger cultural, political, and social reckonings. The problems of modernity, including political revolution, colonialism, industrialization, urbanization, and mass consumption, form the most consequential historical contexts for architectural practice today, and it is these that the course addresses with rigor. The focus on the 18th century to the present is therefore not a gap in coverage but a considered pedagogical position suited to the imperatives of graduate professional education. This approach is not new to this accreditation cycle; the program took the same position in its previous submission, where it was accepted, and nothing fundamental has changed in the curricular scope or intent since that time. It is not clear to us that the mandate of the CACB is to dictate the specific centuries that are required for historical competence or that such calendar-based mandates should be fixed.

However, if the accreditation body's expectations regarding historical coverage do include such mandates, these should be made explicit in the language of SPCs—and appropriately discussed through CACB governance. We appreciate the challenges of teaching history, its core role in an architect’s education, but also that any education in architectural history must be a beginning to historical inquiry rather than presuming a canonical totality that might once have been thought a possibility.

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.

1 Spadina Crescent
Toronto, ON M5S 2J5
Canada
416-978-5038

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

While the Architectural History and Theory sequence ARC1031 and ARC1032 significantly opens up timely discussions about the production of knowledge and the power relations unwittingly embedded in the built environment, ARC1012 Studio 2 introduces students to Indigenous perspectives. Because advanced standing students start their studies at the beginning of second year, the position of these important courses in first year precludes one third of the cohort from being exposed to fundamental concepts and engaging experiences of cultural diversity and global perspectives and more crucially, the societal roles and responsibilities of architects. Moreover, nothing in the Advanced Standing Eligibility form checks whether these students have previously gained understanding of the elements covered by this SPC.

ARC2017 Research Methods and some elective courses and option studios address aspects cultural diversity and to some extant global perspectives through readings and thematic investigations, but achieving any understanding varies greatly as it depends on the personal interest of the student and of the instructor. ARC2014, the VT learned, is less concerned with engaging meaningfully with diverse cultural and social contexts than it is with sustainability and climate concerns. So even though the syllabus presented to the VT did allow students some interaction with vulnerable communities, this is not necessarily carried over to successive editions of the studio, making it difficult to ascertain the degree to which all students can “develop design responses that are informed by cultural sensitivity, social equity, and an awareness of the architect’s responsibility to serve diverse communities.”

Program Response:

This assessment raises an important issue regarding the interpretation of the accreditation criteria, specifically that the identified SPC must be demonstrably met within the timeframe of the Advanced Standing students’ duration in the program. Had this expectation been clearly stated in the Terms and Conditions, we would have structured our evidence differently and selected assessment material more heavily from the second- and third-year curriculum, where these competencies were also satisfied for Advanced Standing students. During the team’s visit, we would have welcomed the opportunity to present additional courses and student work beyond those identified in the APR to demonstrate more fully how these learning outcomes are addressed across the Advanced Standing curriculum.

That said, in the coursework identified in the Matrix, ARC2017 Research Methods is intentionally structured to provide all students, including Advanced Standing students, with a systematic framework for developing independent research agendas connected to architectural practice, cultural diversity, and global perspectives. Engagement with these themes does not depend on the interests of individual students or instructors; it is embedded directly into the required course structure through assigned readings, lectures, debates, research exercises, and guest presentations that all students complete. Eight of the twelve weeks include mandatory readings or directed listening that foreground Indigenous or global perspectives in architecture. Representative examples include Indigenous curator Candice Hopkins's examination of the colonial nature of archives in Canada through the founding of the U'mista and Nuyumbalees cultural centres, and Nontsikelelo Mutiti's ethnographic study of the cultural linkages between hair-braiding studios in New York and Johannesburg, exploring migration, identity, and everyday cultural practice. From Week 1, students engage with Eve Tuck's writing on extractive versus collaborative relationships between researchers and Indigenous communities, an ethical thread that runs throughout the course. In Week 8, a case study on the Nunavut Atlas examines how cartographers and Inuit communities collaborated to map Indigenous spatial

1 Spadina Crescent
Toronto, ON M5S 2J5
Canada
416-978-5038

knowledge, contributing to the political process that established Nunavut as Canada's third territory and redistributed power to its predominantly Inuit population. This case study models how methodological choices determine whose knowledge is made visible. Students apply this awareness directly in Project 3, writing a method statement in which they select research methods, reflect on what they anticipate learning, identify potential gaps, and propose ways to address them.

These discussions are further reinforced through weekly in-class debates held from Weeks 3–12, in which students develop and present arguments connected to their semester-long research projects. Many of these projects examine architecture and urbanization within diverse cultural contexts. In Week 10, inspired by the Canadian Centre for Architecture's Centering Africa research fellowship, all students shift to a presentation format to present their research questions, case studies, and hypotheses in greater depth. Together, the debates and presentations make questions of cultural diversity, global perspectives, representation, and social responsibility central and recurring components of the course rather than optional areas of engagement.

ARC2014 Design Studio 4 (Comprehensive Building Project) is correctly identified as being strongly engaged with climate crisis–related themes; however, it is important to clarify that this focus is not limited to envelope performance or technical resolution. Rather, climate crisis is also addressed through the lens of diverse needs, values, and social and spatial patterns across socio-economic groups, and through the implications of this diversity for the societal roles and responsibilities of architects. In this sense, environmental performance is consistently framed as inseparable from civic life, public use, and community-based programming.

In 2024-25, the studio partnered with The West Neighbourhood House, addressing homelessness and the housing crisis through architectural responses to urgent social need. In 2025-26, the studio shifted to a partnership with Scadding Court Community Centre, engaging directly with essential civic services including food bank operations, swimming facilities, gym spaces, and emergency cooling and heating centres, redefining the future of the community centre as a form of public infrastructure. Students worked directly with Scadding Court community stakeholders throughout the design process, ensuring that social need and public responsibility were not abstract considerations but active determinants of design. These programmatic partnerships are foundational to how students understand architecture as civic practice. We note, however, that it may fall outside the purview of the Visiting Team to evaluate work produced in the 2025-26 academic year, and we raise this example primarily to demonstrate the consistency and trajectory of the studio's commitment to this criterion across successive editions.

Finally, we would note that two additional required third-year courses, ARC3015 Options Studio and ARC3018 Thesis Seminar, also address this criterion and were acknowledged in PPC3 as satisfying global perspectives requirements. These courses are completed by all M.Arch. students, including those on the Advanced Standing track, and together with ARC2017 and ARC2014 constitute a robust and consistent pathway through which B4 is met across the full cohort.

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 ☑**

Parts of this SPC are covered in courses ARC 2023 (passive environmental design strategies and evaluation modeling of impacts on thermal comfort and energy performance), ARC 2047 (introduction of active mechanical systems, and ARC 2048 (passive systems, thermal performance reporting and net-zero design strategies). Despite this progression, engagement with active systems, including mechanical system fundamentals, and code integration remain limited within assignment requirements. Student work demonstrates strong competency in analytical tools and environmental performance evaluation, but there is no evidence of engagement with NECB energy code analysis and its impact on building design.

Program Response:

The Visiting Team's concerns are addressed across ARC2014 Design Studio 4 Comprehensive Building Project, ARC2047 Building Science 3, and ARC2048 Building Science 4, which together form a coordinated sequence covering both active and passive environmental systems, code compliance, and performance assessment.

Active mechanical systems are covered in depth in ARC2047, which progresses systematically from psychrometric processes through heating and cooling loads, HVAC distribution, and the fundamentals of compressive refrigeration and heat pumps. These concepts are introduced through lectures, reinforced through quizzes, and assessed through assignments. This foundation is then carried into a carefully coordinated sequence of assignments between ARC2048 and ARC2014, designed to move students through two deliberate stages: first, understanding performance requirements and code compliance; and second, integrating these considerations directly into design. In ARC2048, students establish key building assemblies, including walls, floors, and roofs, as well as mechanical equipment and systems requirements, evaluated in the context of both performance targets and code obligations. Once established, these assemblies and systems are brought into ARC2014, where students integrate them into their comprehensive building designs. To support this process of integration, mechanical, sustainability, and facade consultants are invited to provide feedback at multiple points in the term, participating in desk crits, pin-ups, and formal reviews tied to Assignments 2 and 3 of ARC2014. This coordinated structure ensures that systems knowledge is not treated in isolation but is developed in direct and continuous relationship to design decision-making.

On the question of energy code, the criterion requires understanding of "codes and regulations governing the application of environmental systems in buildings" and does not specify the National Energy Code for Buildings. **In Toronto, where the program is situated, the Toronto Green Standard is mandatory for all new construction and sets more stringent energy performance targets than the base NECB.** ARC2047 addresses the Toronto Green Standard explicitly, as evidenced in the Week 11 lecture slides from November 12, 2024 and subsequently applied in the design assignment. Compliance with

the Toronto Green Standard therefore satisfies both the letter and the intent of this criterion and arguably represents a more rigorous standard of code literacy than familiarity with the NECB alone.

Beyond code compliance, the program takes a forward-looking position: students are prepared for levels of energy and carbon performance that will be required five to ten years from now. Rather than orienting toward the transitional or step targets currently implemented in the NECB and Toronto Green Standard, the curriculum prioritizes passive and architectural strategies as the primary means of environmental control, supplemented by on-site renewable energy and very low-powered, fully electric active systems.

Yours sincerely,



Prof. Vivian Lee
Program Director, Master of Architecture



Prof. Robert Levit
Acting Dean, John H. Daniels Faculty of
Architecture, Landscape, and Design

1 Spadina Crescent
Toronto, ON M5S 2J5
Canada
416-978-5038