CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL CERTIFICATION BOARD

CONSEIL CANADIEN DE CERTIFICATION EN ARCHITECTURE

2025 Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture Program. M. Arch.

Institution:
University of Manitoba

The Canadian Architectural Certification Board
1 Nicholas Street, Suite 710
Ottawa (Ontario) Canada K1N 7B7
Voice: (613) 241-8399
Fax: (613) 241-7991
E-mail: info@cacb.ca
Web Site: www.cacb-ccca.ca

Table of Contents

I. Introduction: The CACB Accreditation

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

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

b) Six-year term with a "focused evaluation" at the end of three years: Indicates that significant deficiencies exist in meeting the requirements of the CACB Conditions and Terms for

Accreditation; consideration of these deficiencies will form the basis of a focused evaluation. The *Program* is required to report on its particular deficiencies during the third year.

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

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

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

Term for Reinstated Accreditation

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

II. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team's General Comments

The Visiting Team (VT) reviewed the professional Master of Architecture (M.Arch) and pre-professional Bachelor of Environmental Design (B.Env.D.) of the Faculty of Architecture (FAUM) at the University of Manitoba (UM), from March 13th to March 18th 2025. The visit was conducted according to the 2017 CACB Conditions and Terms for Accreditation and the 2017 CACB Procedures for Accreditation, using the hybrid visit model with virtual student exhibition and entrance meetings, followed by onsite meetings with faculty, staff, and students.

The VT thanks Terri Fuglem, Head of the Department of Architecture, and the Program's dedicated 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. An additional meeting with the Partners Program coordinator was added during the visit.

In addition to the report, the VT requested, and received, before and during the visit, supplementary information about the teaching load matrix, workshop safety training and availability of the workshop and fabrication resources, the Fall 2023 ARCH 7050 student work, the Fall 2023 EVAR 3000 student work, survey questions and answers from the self-assessment process, the Forest School, evidence about cost estimating and energy modeling, and statistics about Indigenous and Metis population in the student body.

The Program helpfully provided some examples of very low pass student work. For SPCs that were not met, the VT was careful to ensure that the requirements were also not met in high pass student work.

2. Conditions for Accreditation "Met" and "Not Met": A Summary

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

C4. Envelope Systems	☑	☐
C5. Environmental Systems	☐	☑

D. Comprehensive Design

D1. Comprehensive Design	☐	☑

E: Professional Practice

E1. The Architectural Profession	☑	☐
E2. Ethical and Legal Responsibilities	☑	☐
E3. Modes of Practice	☑	☐
E4. Professional Contracts	☑	☐
E5. Project Management	☐	☑

3. Program's Progress since the Previous Site Visit (From Previous VTR)

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

Causes of Concern from 2018 VTR

Program

#1 Transition and flux
#2 Diversity of opportunities for students
#3 Teaching Building Systems Integration
#4 Interdisciplinarity
#5 Enrolment numbers

Student Performance

#1 Collaborative Skills
#2 Building Systems Integration

The time since our last accreditation review can be broken down into three periods:

Three terms of a pre-pandemic "old normal"
Five terms of a pandemic and labour strike ridden "new normal"
Five terms of post-pandemic restoration and rejuvenation

Across that time three senior colleagues departed our ranks; the department added two tenure-track colleagues and one tenured colleague; a search is on for two new tenure-track hires; and we have had four Department Heads including a new hire in an external search. Considering the difficulties we faced in the middle part of this period, the program has made significant progress towards the five program and two student performance causes of concern expressed in the 2018 VTR.

We've come to see an interconnectivity through our accumulated responses to the issues of transition and flux (concern 1) and enrolment numbers (concern 5). We found a synergy in responding to issues of diversity of student opportunity (concern 2), interdisciplinarity (concern 4), and collaborative skills (SPC 1). Building Systems Integration mentioned in both program (concern 3) and student performance (SPC 2) issues have opened a dialog between the constituent faculty resulting in better term-by-term integration of concepts and connections within the existing technology sequence, enhancing building systems teaching, and in the final Building Technology course experimenting with ways of introducing evolving building systems tools that enable comparisons of qualitative and quantitative measurement of environmental phenomena.

The pandemic made the idea of stability elusive and a great amount of effort since has been put into restoration and rejuvenation of our present and spatial program culture after two years of distanced learning. learning. One way to assure stability is to ensure a stable flow of applicants, admissions, enrolments, and and graduation. Traditional sources for admits has fluctuated, and the intake of international students dropped dropped dramatically and then spiked. We have initiated efforts to build a specific path into the program for program for graduates from pre-professional Canadian and professional international programs. The program program has opened up the admissions process to include all professors in the program in the review of of applicants. This has built a knowledgeable dialog about who is applying. The department has reflected on reflected on the capacities of the AMP path through the program. We've done some recruiting, which seems seems to have paid off in increased numbers, and we've consulted admissions advisors from other units in units in the university to find ways to attract a more diverse population from our own campus as well as from as from the University of Winnipeg. We have worked towards stability by harnessing more control over our over our admissions process to generate a stable student population from a more diverse set of sources for

sources for candidates and to tailor the curriculum to a variety of changing educational backgrounds at admission. Though these efforts are still not complete, they already have begun to have a significant effect on admissions and will pay more dividends as they are finalized.

Increasing focused teaching of collaborative skills in the curriculum and enhancing opportunities for interdisciplinary teaching in the professional curriculum have resulted in a better diversity of student opportunities across the professional curriculum. Opening up the ED4 level of studio teaching to term-long courses of study has greatly enhanced the opportunities for this. Professor Rueda has run a series of cross-disciplinary studios with faculty from City Planning. Professors Bailey and Coar have been running studios that work with Indigenous communities in Manitoba and Ontario. Professor Garcia Holguera teaches her studio with associated instructors from Biology. We've been able to engage more young professionals as adjunct studio instructors with the term-long studios, and they've brought wonderful technical and professional expertise along with fresh eyes, while building a critical collaborative connection to the profession as well.

The loss of study abroad for two years has only strengthened and enriched our resolve to engage opportunities for travel study, including experiencing a sustainable farm in rural Manitoba and travel to destinations in Canada, and as far as Chile, Italy, Iceland and France. We have clarified an appropriate place in the curriculum for extended term-long study abroad, and we are seeing an uptick in both directions of students taking part in exchanges with schools in Australia, Germany, and Belgium.

The Faculty's Co-op program continues to be a valuable resource for internships and other employment. Co-op fluctuated with the pandemic and now has been restored to fully operational and ripe with employment opportunities. This seems particularly valuable for international students who are unfamiliar with this professional community. The loss of Dr. Landrum, who has been the progenitor and strong champion for the Co-op program has been felt, but our recently announced new Associate Dean for Research, Dr. Shauna Mallory-Hill, is taking up the role with the same focus and determination to see the Co-op thrive and succeed. Students regularly avail themselves of this opportunity, but we have not integrated the experience into the core curriculum to the extent suggested in the 2018 VTR, as we need to increase the number of Co-op opportunities available for students.

This has been anything but a stable period in the program's history, with so many external forces demanding our attention and adjustment. We've had the opportunity to rebuild our present community. Our social practices and understanding of who our students are, who we are, and the privileges we carry are incredibly different from where we were in 2018. We are a small program with limited resources, but we've made significant changes warranted by a difficult time.

4. Program Strengths

01- Students, faculty, support staff and administrators all share a commitment to the success of the Program. They are working together in identifying and developing its strengths, expressing a broad alignment with each other's goals and priorities. Both the curriculum and other activities demonstrate that faculty members have a common vision of the Program that is also shared by support staff. This is particularly visible in the integration of lecture courses and studios and in the regular participation of professors in each other's teaching, resulting in topical studios that build on each faculty member's research while sharing a commitment to innovation and creativity.

02- Community engagement is a strong focus and a success, manifesting in program components such as the downtown studio and in studios based in rural and Indigenous communities. Additionally, the Partners Program is a strong manifestation of the close relationship between the Program and the local professional community.

03- The engagement with Indigenous knowledge is visible throughout the curriculum. In addition to a sustained engagement with local communities, many courses and studios are enriched through the appreciated support of an Elder-in-Residence and Indigenous scholars participating in many courses and studios.

04- UM administrators appreciate and celebrate the Program's engagement with local communities and with Indigenous knowledge and see it as a major contribution to the development of the University.

05- Awareness of sustainable solutions is integrated not just in courses and studios, but also in other learning opportunities such as lectures and workshops (for example in experiments in recycled materials such as creating new materials out of sawdust).

06- The Program benefits from the high quality of its workshops and labs allowing the integration of both analog and digital hands-on experiments in the learning experience. These facilities are supported by enthusiastic and engaged staff that participate in teaching and contribute to innovative research.

07- A sense of community is strongly felt among faculty, staff and students. It is particularly notable that students are positively and enthusiastically engaged with the Program.

5. Causes of Concern and Team's Recommendations

01- The Program currently functions with a limited number of faculty and dedicated support staff, resulting in heavy service load that limits potential for conducting, completing, publishing, and sharing research, as well as for supervising and supporting students. The lack of dedicated support staff for the Department Head appears to particularly impact their administrative load and, ultimately, the potential for development of the Program.

02- There is currently a gender imbalance in full-time faculty that does not mirror the gender balance of the student body.

03- While student work displays an understanding of different aspects of technical knowledge and design principles, the integration of these different elements is not consistently visible in comprehensive design projects.

04- If courses, studios and other Program activities show a deep engagement with sustainability principles, student work often revolves around typical "one size fits all" answers that do not reflect the level of engagement that would be expected given the Program's focus on Indigenous knowledge and environmental stewardship. Similarly, the limited presence of urban design and ecological thinking in studio work appears to be a missed opportunity considering this engagement and the presence of city planning and landscape architecture departments within the Faculty of Architecture.

05- As currently organized, there appears to be almost no coordination between the first two years of the B.Env.D., shared between the four disciplines of the FAUM, and the disciplinary option in architecture in third and fourth years. This leads to potential and reported repetition or contradiction in the subjects presented in courses, thus limiting the depth of exploration of required knowledge over the full course of the Program.

06- The Program offers many opportunities for trips abroad which, coupled with the large number of international students, allows for an awareness of global perspectives. However, the curriculum remains Western-based and students note that efforts to present examples of non-Western approaches in both technical and history/theory courses are inconsistent from year to year or topic to topic.

07- The Program has unique strengths that have developed over many years, including the degree of integration of indigeneity, sustainability and community engagement across lecture courses, studios and events. However, the Program remains modest in sharing and putting forward its strengths and accomplishments, which might have an impact on student attraction and faculty recruitment.

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** ☐

The APR describes the Program's self-assessment process, specifically in relation to the preparation for the report, beginning in September 2023. Observations gathered through faculty meetings (2023-2024), a student meeting (September 2024), a meeting with the Manitoba Association of Architects (September 2024) and a survey of graduates from 2017 to 2024 are summarized in the report. In addition to the summary presented in the APR, survey questions and results were shared with the VT.

An internal evaluation of the Environmental Design Program has also been recently completed. However, DoA faculty report having had very limited input in the evaluation process, despite the importance of the first two years of the ED Program as foundation years for the architecture option ED3 and ED4 years.

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 information required by the CACB is provided in the Program's Report and easily available on the Program's 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** ☐

The task force on EDIA action plan shows the University's commitment to EDIA. Discussion with the Department Head and faculty about these initiatives revealed empathy and attention to the needs of various student profiles.

Evidence is found in the diversity of faculty members and several studio sections expose students to diverse contexts.

The VT notes that extra effort is required for mobility-challenged students to access the library stacks and understands that this is due to constraints of the existing historical building in which the library is housed, and that the library seeks to serve these students in other ways. Also, both the Architecture II and Russell Building are only wheelchair accessible from the tunnel system, and not the exterior. This impedes wheelchair movement between both buildings and the CAST workshop.

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 Program fully demonstrates provision for student support and success, both within the department and faculty and at the university level. The Program offers a variety of lecture series, symposia, workshops, exhibitions that enrich the curricula. All syllabi include detailed information of where to get different types of help, something that is greatly appreciated by the diverse student body. Academic advisors and the Partners Program are also valued resources. The student associations are active. Some students, however, shared concerns with gender bias in grading where women's work was less recognized.

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** ☐

Due to recent resignations and retirements, the current number of full-time faculty is low, but searches are currently underway for two new tenure-track faculty positions. This limited number of faculty results in heavy service load that limits potential for conducting, completing and publishing research and for supporting and supervising students.

The current faculty team brings together diverse research, practice experiences and interests. Among full-time faculty, three have completed PhDs, three have PhDs in progress, and four are practicing architects. In addition to its ten full-time faculty and one half-time instructor, the program can count on almost twenty part-time sessional instructors with a wide range of expertise and experience, including two with PhDs and four with other post-professional degrees. Research start-up funds and annual research and travel allocation allow faculty to develop their research.

A teaching load matrix, currently under revision, guides the Department Head and faculty in equitably achieving their 40/40/20 teaching/research/service ratio. Typical yearly teaching loads for full time faculty include two 9 credit studios, one 3 credit lecture course, one 1.5 credit elective topics course and supervision of 1 to 5 thesis students. Design studios are capped at 15 students, as per CACB requirements.

In addition to the teaching team, the Program benefits from an engaged support team in technical/technology services and administration. Until recently, an Elder-in-Residence was also present three days a week, although this position is currently vacant following the passing of the previous Elder. Administrative support staff is shared with other FAUM departments, with student advisors split by program. Since all administrative staff support the whole FAUM, the lack of dedicated support staff for the Department Head appears to particularly impact on their administrative load and, ultimately, the potential for development of the Program.

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 academic and research needs of the students and faculty appear to be well supported by the Faculty's key facilities, including the recently upgraded Architecture 2 and Russell Buildings, as well as the Centre for Architecture Structures and Technology (C.A.S.T.). Labeled plans of each are provided in the APR that identify relevant areas, including teaching, making, research, and exhibition spaces.
Despite renovations to the Architecture 2 building, completed in late 2018, which are described in detail, students and alumni have commented that technology could be improved or added to both classrooms and studio spaces. Other more recent upgrades and initiatives include the acquisition of a large format printer (Nov 2023) and scanner (Feb 2024) totaling almost $120,000 for the CADLab. The workshop has been recently updated, including the acquisition of new tools, safety equipment and other amenities, and has focused on salvaged and recycled material for student use. Workshop and fabrication resources are described in detail, as well as available information technology. Workshop safety and training are well-addressed with proper documentation.

A new BIOMLab (facility for the study of biomaterials) is being planned for integration into the C.A.S.T., as well as an expansion to its Research in Residence program.

A possible cause for concern is accessibility. In particular, barrier-free access to the Library located in the Russell Building is not ideal, as wheelchair users are forced to access the library through the loading dock area of the building. Similarly, the Russell Building and Arch 2 are only wheelchair accessible from the tunnel system, not the exterior. This impedes wheelchair movement between both buildings and the CAST workshop.

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** ☐

Established in 1930, the Architecture/Fine Arts Library is one of the oldest of its kind in Canada, serving all departments in the FAUM as well as the School of Fine Arts. The collection of monographs within architecture classifications is very healthy (96,552). There are 17,000 print periodicals and over 41,000 e-books. The annual monograph acquisition budget is reasonable, averaging approximately $28.5k. It is not clear what the current periodical and e-book budget is.

The monograph collection has a solid non-western selection and now includes recent purchases in Indigenous art and design as well as books on Black history-related architectural studies. Further, the Head Librarian is focused on creating a diverse collection including a focus on feminist work in art and architecture.

Additional collections include GIS (assistance available from University of Manitoba Libraries as well as the Head Librarian, who is GIS knowledgeable), archives, government documents, databases, vertical files, photo imagery, video, drawings and theses. It should be noted that theses are currently only available in print while other programs in the university make them available online.

The facility is staffed with 2-3 library assistants and the position of Head Librarian was recently filled by the former Humanities Liaison Librarian (LL) who had already been dedicated to the Architecture/Fine Arts Library. The Head Librarian provides Information Resources Literacy Instruction and research assistance. The library is open 5 days a week during regular working hours.

A recent initiative by the University of Manitoba Libraries is a Libraries Indigenous Action Plan, though it is unclear how this will be implemented.

A cause of concern is poor barrier-free access to the lower-level stacks. The route is circuitous outside the library proper via elevator, through maintenance corridors, and requires the assistance of a librarian to open doors. Finally, it was noted that the slab on grade in the lower level has settled considerably in one corner (a long-standing problem).

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

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

Since the last visit, after consultation, the UM has implemented in 2018-2019 a new activity-based budget model instead of its previous incremental budget model. The new model has moved budget decisions to the FAUM. The APR notes that, in part because of factors such as COVID and faculty turnover, the budget has fluctuated notably. Uncertainty remains for the next years due to external and internal factors such as the economic trade wars and the recently signed new UM collective agreement, but everyone met by the VT seemed confident that teaching would not be impacted and that cuts could be managed in additional projects outside of the core programs.

The APR lists research start-up funds, research and travel allocation funds, teaching development funds, and financial support for professional fees and studio support. Additionally, around $425,000 is available

annually for scholarships (awarded based on merit) and bursaries (provided based on financial need). Additional funding is also available for teaching assistantships. Funding comes from the FAUM, the UM VP Research, and the FAUM Endowment Fund.

9. Administrative Structure (Academic Unit & Institution)

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

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

Evidence of the Program's autonomy was provided in discussions with the Department Head, the Dean, and the university's administration. The Program is seen by the administration as a meaningful contributor to the university's strategic planning process.

The Program is housed within its own department, one of four (plus a shared Environmental Design Program) within the FAUM. Budgeting and support is handled at the FAUM level, but the DoA maintains autonomy in recommending appointments and promotion of teaching staff, assigning teaching and service duties, leading Department Council, recommending budget estimates. The responsibilities of the Department Head as chief executive officer of the DoA are similar to other UM Department Heads, as summarized in a University policy statement included in the APR.

The undergraduate Environmental Design Program that leads into the professional M.Arch is shared between the four FAUM departments, with almost no involvement of DoA faculty members in the first two years of the ED program. A coordinating committee exists but has rarely met since the last visit, which, it was reported, is very problematic when coordinating courses and pedagogical orientations to ensure a smooth transition into the 3rd and 4th year architectural specialization at the undergraduate level. Discussions are currently being held to rethink the governance of the ED program, but concerns remain among faculty members that the DoA has little say in the development of the Program's foundation years.

10. Professional Degrees and Curriculum

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

The Programs include:

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

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

The accredited Architecture Program consists of years 3 and 4 of the B.Env.D. Program, followed by the two-year M.Arch program. A three-year professional M.Arch degree option is offered for international students with a pre-professional architecture degree, but who require additional exposure to the Canadian design context.

Applicants to the M.Arch program may apply as graduates of the University of Manitoba B.Env.D. (Architecture Option), or as graduates of a comparable four-year pre-professional degree from another institution. Students with an undergraduate degree in a field outside of the design disciplines may apply to the Architecture Master Preparation program (AMP), a one or two-year pre-Masters preparatory program. Successful applicants with a non-design degree are admitted to AMP1, a two-year program of study which serves as the prerequisite for the 2-year M.Arch. Successful applicants with a related design degree such as Interior or Urban Design, may be admitted to AMP2, a one-year program of study which serves as the prerequisite to the 2-year M.Arch. AMP1 and AMP2 students follow the third and fourth year of ED curriculum.

The APR summarizes this structure as '2+2+2'; two years of Foundation Studies + two years of Environmental Design studies (Architecture Option) + two years of M.Arch studies. As such, the Architecture Program meets the general requirements of two of the CACB-recognized program structures:

1. Programs with a minimum of five years of post-secondary study culminating in a master of architecture degree, which follows a pre-professional bachelor's degree; and
2. Programs with 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.

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 (PPC)

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 provides a description of the Program's 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, and refers to the participation of practitioners in its studios, courses, seminars and workshops, including indigenous practitioners. This is well supported by the faculty composition.

Of the 10.5 full-time faculty members, five are licensed with the Manitoba Association of Architects, and another is licensed abroad. Courses ARCH 7040 and ARCH 7350 expose students to Professional Practice and Legal Aspects of Architectural Practice. Studios are taught by or engage with practitioners and provide exposure to career path options. Engineers, industry representatives, construction lawyers and other professionals also contribute to courses.

Exhibitions, guest lectures, and other special events also expose students to practitioners and the profession. The Partners Program furthers this exposure by linking faculty and students to industry partners and potential funding. Housed within the Partners Program, the Co-op Program offers learning through real-world experience. Faculty and students expressed a desire for an expansion of the Co-op Program.

Ultimately, the program seems well integrated and active in the architectural profession in Manitoba.

PPC 2. Design Education

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

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

The APR, student work, and discussions with faculty and students provide evidence that the Program is successfully achieving its statement from the APR that "Design culture infuses the curriculum, and the technology and history/theory courses support, inform and inspire the design studios." Students are exposed to a broad range of topics (e.g. social, historical, cultural, and ecological) in their courses and studios. Full-time faculty and sessionals who are practicing architects expand discussion towards both theoretical research and professional and technical considerations.

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** ☐

Global perspectives and environmental stewardship permeate many areas of the program, most explicitly in the ways indigeneity is integrated into curricular and extra-curricular activities: ex. the Forest School, land-based teaching, community engagement, studio projects, symposia, etc. In ED 3 and ED 4, students are offered the opportunity to go on field trips, both elsewhere in Canada and abroad, to learn about other architectural cultures and sustainable design approaches. Remarkably, the wood shop recuperates saw dust and paper to press into model-making materials, which is an example of how students are implicitly invited to think about their environmental impact.

The VT noticed that although there is movement towards greater inclusion of non-Western architecture and of critical readings of the Western canon in the pre-modern and modern history-theory course sequences, often by inviting guest lecturers to class, the syllabi and work presented to the VT tend to be heavily focused on the Western canon as evidenced by the course bibliographies and lecture topics both within the classroom and in lecture series. Students can study non-western architecture in their term assignments, but it remains an individual initiative.

The VT notes that some students who would like to travel outside the country on field trips are unable to as they do not have enough information and lead time to apply for the required visas.

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

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

The Program describes how it supports and fosters effective individual and team dynamics, a spirit of collaboration and inclusion, community engagement, and diverse approaches to leadership. The APR outlines the design studios and other learning opportunities that incorporate these notions, including student exchanges, interdisciplinary courses and design/ build projects.

Design studios (including EVAR 3008, 3010, 4004, 4010, ARCH 7050 and 7060) are enhanced by studio-based collaborations through incorporation of external expertise and examples include celebrated design/build projects like the International Warming Huts competition. The projects are organized to support the development of leadership skills as students lead aspects of the collective work. Community engagement is fostered through studio teaching where community partners are invited to participate. The Elder-in-Residence's influence and leadership is also noted.

Interdisciplinary collaborations occur in certain design courses (i.e. EVAR 4004 and 4010, as architecture students work together with engineering students on City of Winnipeg projects with relevant stakeholders), EVDS 3710 (taught by architecture and landscape architecture professors and involving a First Nations community), ARCG 7070/ MECH 4322, EVDS 3710 and ENG 4100 (design/ build featuring First Nations feasting shelter).

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** ☐

It is clear the program integrates building technology learning in several ways, from the coupling of undergraduate design studios with EVAR 4002 and 4008 to the specialized technical studies aligned with graduate studios, culminating in the Technology thesis report. While thesis designs are less convincing from a technological lens, the program instructs building system design in progressively complex increments and many courses are offered at undergraduate and graduate levels.

Comprehensive Design Studios (ARCH 7050 and 7060) syllabi indicate an appropriate focus on the technical aspects of student design projects; however student work does not consistently integrate all aspects of building construction.

The VT is concerned that an over-reliance on 'silver bullet' solutions (CLT, EFTE, Passive Ventilation) sidesteps an understanding of the principles guiding building envelope and system design.

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** ☐

As with other 4-year programs with 2-year Undergraduate and 2-Year Graduate degrees, there is little time for study outside of architecture beyond the foundation years (ED1 and ED2). The PPC is met outside the program in electives and general studies taken in either ED1 and ED2 undergraduate studies or in degrees from outside institutions. However, there remain opportunities for collaboration within UM that are not being explored; students currently experience through the four-year Program (ED3, ED4, M1, and M2) a range of courses focused only on architectural studies.

11.2 Student Performance Criteria (SPC)

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** ☐

The student work from the ARCH 7050 - 7060 sequence makes good use of precedent or theory and demonstrates an understanding of design methodology. Evidence is also found in EVAR 4010.

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** ☐

Student work in all studio, technology, and history and theory courses displayed varying levels of ability to apply design theories, methods, and precedents.

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** ☐

All evidence provided shows a broad range of design tools being used, with increasing competency as students progress through the program.

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** ☑

In EVAR 3008, 3010, 4004, and 4010, a design response to precedent research is evident in student work, but the ability to analyze and respond to client and user needs, determine appropriate space and equipment requirements, or account for relevant laws and site selection, is often weak and inconsistent. Student work in ARCH 7050 includes much analysis, but the design responses fall short of a cohesive outcome that integrates all requirements of the SPC.

A5. Site Context and Design

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

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

Evidence is found in the EVAR 3008, 3010, 4004, and 4010 design studios, along with the more technical EVAR 4002 and 4008 courses. At the graduate level, in ARCH 7050, much analysis is presented, but the ability to respond to site characteristics is not always evident, as design solutions are often vaguely represented and professor-dependent.
The ability for students to participate in community- and land-based studios is positive.

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** ☑

Urban design is inconsistently treated across all sections of the ARCH 7060 studio. Only one section considered historical, social, physical and regulatory complexities before suggesting appropriate building typologies and proposing architectural volumes adequate for the urban fabric. In EVAR 4010, the section co-taught with a professor from City Planning touches on urban design, however, the other sections limit student work to rudimentary analysis of urban conditions. Documentation regarding urban analysis, even from a qualitative perspective, is difficult to locate across all projects presented. From the evidence provided, few students effectively respond to urban context in the design process and in their resulting project.

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 EVAR 4002, EVAR 4008, and ARCH 7060.

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 EVAR 4002, EVAR 4008 and ARCH 7060.

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 ARCH 7070 and EVAR 4010.

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

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
Evidence is found in EVAR 3000, EVAR 3002, EVAR 4000, and EVAR 4006.

A deficiency was the acknowledged western bias in the course content. While non-western histories sporadically seen in the core courses, there are opportunities within other elective courses (ARCH 7020/7030 Research Topics) for students to research non-western traditions.

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 the undergraduate pre-modern and modern history/theory sequence (EVAR 3000, EVAR 3002, EVAR 4000, and EVAR 4006).

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** ☑

Student work provided suggests that not all students meaningfully engage with "...implications of diversity on the societal roles and responsibilities of architects." The architectural history/theory sequence (EVAR 3000, EVAR 3002, EVAR 4000, and EVAR 4006) primarily focuses on a Western canon. Although some effort is made to include Asian and Ottoman examples, they often exemplify the dominant architectural narrative, rather than as works of architecture in their own right.

The visiting team notes that students are given a choice to explore non-Western building projects, but it remains a personal initiative.

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** ☑

Student work demonstrated an awareness of the immediate impact of design on sustainability from a building science perspective. However, there was limited evidence of students understanding buildings within the ecosystems in which they are situated.

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 EVAR 4002, EVAR 4008, and ARCH 7060. However, all presented evidence of code analysis is compartmentalized and suggests a limited understanding of the broader interrelation of regulatory framework.
Universality as a concept of accessibility is not present in any student work.

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 lecture courses and studios EVAR 3004, EVAR 3006, and ARCH 7050, with strong integration between lecture courses and studios.

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 lecture courses and studios EVAR 3004, EVAR 3006, EVAR 4002, EVAR 4004, EVAR 4008, and ARCH 7060.

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 lecture courses and studios EVAR 3006 and ARCH 7060.

C5. Environmental Systems
The student must have an understanding of the basic principles that inform the design of passive and active environmental modification and building service systems, the issues involved in the coordination of these systems in a building, energy use and appropriate tools for performance assessment, and the codes and regulations that govern their application in buildings.

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

Though course outlines and some evidence of environmental systems in student work is found in EVAR 4002, EVAR 4008, the majority of ARCH 7060 in both low and high pass examples does not indicate an understanding of the requirements of this SPC. There is minimal evidence that energy use and tools for performance assessment are being taught.

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** ☑

While some elements of this criteria (environmental systems, building envelope and assemblies, and regulatory requirements) are seen in other courses (EVAR 4002 and 4008), they are not sufficiently and consistently integrated in student work in the comprehensive design studios ARCH 7050 and 7060.

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 ARCH 7040 and ARCH 7350. Paths to licensure are addressed in a lecture in EVAR 4002, but there is no evidence of an understanding of this in student work.

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 ARCH 7040 and ARCH 7350.

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 ARCH 7040.

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 ARCH 7040 and ARCH 7350.

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** ☑

While there is evidence of understanding of some aspects of project management in ARCH 7040 and ARCH 7350, there is no indication of learning about building economics or cost control strategies.

IV. Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

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

1- Brief History of the University of Manitoba

The University of Manitoba, established in 1877, was the first university in western Canada, initially conferring degrees for students from its founding colleges: St. Boniface College, St. John's College, and Manitoba College. In 1900, the university began offering its own teaching, with the first facility opening in downtown Winnipeg in 1904. By 1929, the university had moved to its permanent Fort Garry campus. Over time, the university expanded by affiliating with several colleges, including the Manitoba Medical College in 1882, Wesley College in 1888, and St. Paul's College in 1931. St. Boniface College and St. John's College, both founding institutions, remain part of the university. St. Boniface, dating back to 1818, is the only French-speaking College and focuses on training teachers for French-language instruction. St. John's, established in 1820, offers programs in Arts and Science, as well as training for Anglican ministry. The Fort Garry campus features 33 teaching buildings, including homes for four colleges, while a second campus in Central Winnipeg houses the university's health sciences units, including the Faculties of Medicine and Dentistry, and the Schools of Medical Rehabilitation and Dental Hygiene.

2- Institutional Mission

We advance learning by creating, sharing, preserving, and applying knowledge in partnership with diverse communities to promote the cultural, social, and economic well-being and health of Manitoba, Canada, and the world.

3- Program History

The teaching of architecture in Manitoba began in 1913 as a four-year degree program within the Faculty of Arts. In 1920, the program became a part of the newly established Faculty of Engineering and Architecture. In 1938, a three-year diploma program in interior decoration was established. In 1945, the departments of Architecture and Interior Decoration were combined in the School of Architecture and Fine Arts. In 1948, the entire school was reorganized as the School of Architecture. The professional architecture degree became a five-year program, and a new four-year Bachelor of Interior Design degree was also introduced. In 1949, a one-year graduate program in Community Planning was established. In 1957, the Manitoba Legislature approved a grant for the construction of a building for the School of Architecture, the first in Canada to be designed exclusively for architecture education. In 1963, the school was reconstituted as the Faculty of Architecture, and a two-year graduate program leading to the Master of City Planning degree was introduced. In 1966, a new degree of Bachelor of Environmental Studies (Environmental Design from 1992) was added as a prerequisite to the Bachelor of Architecture and a new program in Landscape Architecture, leading to the creation of a Master of Architecture in 1970 and a Master of Landscape Architecture in 1972.

4- Program Mission

The Department of Architecture upholds an architectural education that encourages the intellectual, cultural, technical and professional development of students through exceptional teaching, scholarship and community service in architecture, evolving areas of architectural education and professional practice. The program encourages critical discourse that links theoretical, social, historical and environmental concerns at both the global and local scale. We believe in multiple approaches towards pedagogies and practices in both thinking and making. The Department of Architecture supports and builds upon the Faculty of Architecture's Vision, Mission and Tenets and the University of Manitoba's Mission, Vision, and Values.

5- Program Action Plan

This action plan is based on nearly three years of departmental discussions, including retreats and focused meetings aimed at addressing specific concerns raised in the 2018 CACB Visiting Team Report, while also pursuing long-standing objectives with renewed leadership and support. During Bi-Weekly Friday Accreditation Meetings (held from January 19 - August 9, 2024) various elements of this plan were discussed in greater detail, with a summary distributed to Department Council on August 16, 2024, and unanimously ratified in principle (subject to minor edits).

The Department of Architecture's action plan is first and foremost to pursue its Mission and uphold its Tenets).The plan is further framed by four strategic areas developed in the 2017 APR:

Student Experience

Goals:

- Attract and retain outstanding students;
- Maintain graduate enrolment of 30 incoming M1 students and increase enrolment in Pre-Masters (currently M0) program. Note: We are in a transition period while the ED program is being reviewed;
- Maintain and increase enrolment of 33 incoming Architecture Option students in the Environmental Design program whilst raising the admissions credentials of students;
- Enhance curriculum;
- Enhance student services and access to information;
- Enhance professional opportunities;
- Enhance learning facilities; and
- Enhance alumni relations.

Human Resources

Goals:

- Replenish and increase the number of full-time faculty;
- Improve equity, diversity, inclusion and accessibility in recruitment, hiring, and retention;
- Ensure equitable teaching loads and administrative duties;
- Improve conditions and support for sessional instructors; and
- Support visiting researchers and teachers.

Research Culture

Goals:

- Enhance research, professional, and creative productivity;
- Develop and expand research collaborations; and
- Enhance research impact.

Connections & Community

Goals:

- Strengthen and expand meaningful relations with regional stakeholders; and
- Strengthen and expand collaborations with national and international partners.

(The complete list of actions is presented in the APR, p. 20-27.)

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

MEMBERS OF THE VISITING TEAM

VOTING MEMBERS

Olivier Vallerand — CHAIR — Educator
Phone: (514) 529-5667
Email: Olivier.vallerand@umontreal.ca

Tania Martin — Educator
Tel: (418) 953-6269
Email: tania.martin@arc.ulaval.ca

Rodney Kirkwood — Practitioner
Cell: (250) 213-6748
Email: rskwood@icloud.com

Therese LeBlanc — Practitioner
Phone: (902) 225-1536
Email: leblancmtherese@gmail.com

Ron Christopher Adriano — Intern
Phone: (416) 893-0579
Email: ronc.adriano@gmail.com

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Andrew Wallace — Practitioner
Phone: (306) 914-3481
Email: andrew@wkarch.ca

Neve Toth — Intern
Phone: (506) 333-0715
Email: neve.toth@gmail.com

Michael Robertson — Practitioner
Phone: (204) 471-1482
Email: mike@robertsondesign.ca

OBSERVERS

Zoë Campbell
Phone: (613) 791-0337
Email: accreditation@cacb.ca

Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

Virtual Pre-Visit Planning

January 25th (Sat) **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 **January 30th (Thu)** 1:30-3pm (Central Time) **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 **February 4th (Tue)** 2:30-4pm (Central Time) **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 **February 13th (Thu)** 1:30-3pm (Central Time) **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 **March 4th (Tue)** 2:30-4:30pm (Central Time) **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
March 3rd 10:00-11:30am (Central Time)	○ Entrance meeting with Librarian ○ Ashley Huot - Ashley.Huot@umanitoba.ca

The Visit

Thursday March 13th (Virtual)		○ Team Deliberations and launch of draft VTR
Friday March 14th (Virtual - Central Time)	**AM**	○ 8:00 – 9:00 Entrance meeting with the Program Head (Terri Fuglem) ○ 9:00 – 10:00 Entrance meeting with the Faculty of Architecture Dean (Mira (Mimi) Locher) ○ 10:00 – 11:00 Entrance meeting with Dr. Diane Hiebert-Murphy - Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and Dr. Greg Smith - Vice-Provost (Academic Planning and Programs)
	PM	○ Review of general studies, electives, and related programs ○ Continued review of exhibits and records ○ Continued Team Deliberations and Drafts of VTR
Saturday March 15th	○ Day off (or Travel)	
Sunday March 16th (On-Site)	**AM**	○ Visiting Team's arrival and check-in at the hotel
	PM	○ 9:00 – 11:00 Team-only Brunch ○ 12:00 – 1:00 Visiting Team introductions and orientation • 225 Architecture II ○ 1:00 – 1:30 Short Intro meeting with Program Head • 225 Architecture II ○ 1:30 – 3:00 Tour of facilities with Terri Fuglem ○ 3:30 – 4:30 Entrance meeting with Department of Architecture Faculty (Brian Rex, Carlos Rueda, Eduardo Aquino, Lancelot Coar, Liane Veness, Mercedes Garcia-Holguera, Neil Minuk, Ralph Stern and Shawn Bailey) • 225 Architecture II ○ 6:00 Team-only Dinner and Debriefing session and development of draft VTR
Monday March 17th (On-Site)	**AM**	○ 8:00 – 9:30 Team working breakfast with Program Head ○ 10:00 – 11:00 Meeting with the staff (Tara Vogelsang – Executive Assistant & Human Resources Manager, Michele Brown – Finance & Administration Manager, Tammy Sim – Finance & Administration Officer, Kellen Deighton – Workshop Coordinator, Jon Watts – FABLab Technician, Chris Leigh – CADLab Coordinator, Brandy O'Reilly – Partners Program Coordinator, Lauren Lambert - Co-op/Awards and Exchange coordinator, William Fischer – Department Administrator & Facilities Coordinator, Tobi Hawkins – Graduate Student Advisor, Carrie Johnson – Undergraduate Student Advisor) • 225 Architecture II ○ 11:00 – 12:00 - Observation of studios • Architecture II

	PM	○ 12:00 – 1:30 - Lunch: Meeting with the student representatives (UMAAS) (Sabba Rezai – Co-President (Internal), Dallin Chicoine – Co-President (External), Raha Alihoseini – Co-Vice President: (Internal), Stephen Meijer – Co-Vice President (External), Nicholas Epp – Treasurer & Secretary, Jenna Scheffler – M0 Representative, Sara Yazdi – M1 Representative, Saba Ammari – M2 Representative) • Faculty Lounge – John A. Russell (DeLuca's Catering) ○ 1:30 – 2:30 Entrance Meeting with Department of Architecture students • Centre Space – John A. Russell ○ 3:00 – 4:00 Possible visit to downtown studio *(replaced by a meeting with Carlos Rueda and Richard Milgrom, coordinators of the studio)* • 245 Portage Ave – Curry Building ○ 6:00 – 8:00 Team-only dinner ○ 8:00 – 9:00 Debriefing session, re-draft of VTR and draft of Strengths and Causes of Concern
Tuesday March 18th (On-Site)	**AM**	○ 8:00 – 9:30 Team Breakfast with the Program head and check out from hotel ○ 10:00 – 10:45 Team deliberations and vote • 225 Architecture II ○ 10:45 – 11:15 Exit meeting with Program Head • 225 Architecture II ○ 11:15 – 11:45 Exit meeting with the Faculty of Architecture Dean • 225 Architecture II ○ 11:45 – 12:00 Transit to Administration Building
	PM	○ 12:00 – 12:30 Exit meeting with Michael Benarroch - President, Dr. Diane Hiebert-Murphy Murphy - Provost and Vice-President (Academic) and Dr. Greg Smith - Vice-Provost (Academic Planning and Programs) • 300 Administration Building ○ 1:00 – 2:00 Team-only lunch ○ Travel home

V. Report Signatures

Signed by:
FC0DC879E5B541B...
Olivier Vallerand *Chair*
representing the educators

Signé par :
35628EBB44A74A7...
Tania Martin
representing the educators

Signed by:
53A83B12011F4DB...
Rodney Kirkwood
representing the practitioners

Signed by:
5C5C83341C7C41C...
Therese LeBlanc
representing the practitioners

Signed by:
B1A2556509EB428...
Ron Christopher Adriano
representing the interns

Signed by:
333D68F53A454D1...
Andrew Wallace
CACB non-voting member

Signed by:
899B16E0C5604D0...
Neve Toth
CACB non-voting member

Signed by:
D2166E7081F1419...
Michael Robertson
School non-voting member