CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL CERTIFICATION BOARD

CONSEIL CANADIEN DE CERTIFICATION EN ARCHITECTURE

2024 Visiting Team Report

Master of Architecture Program. M. Arch.

Institution: Carleton University

The Canadian Architectural Certification Board
1 Nicholas Street, Suite 710
Ottawa (Ontario) Canada K1N 7B7
Voice: (613) 241-8399
Fax: (613) 241-7991
E-mail: 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 Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities (CALA), the Canadian Council of University Schools of Architecture (CCUSA), and the Canadian Architecture Students Association (CASA). The CACB is a decision-making and policy-generating body. It is the sole organization recognized by the architectural profession in Canada to assess the educational qualifications of architecture graduates (*Certification* Program) and to accredit professional degree programs in architecture that are offered by Canadian universities (*Accreditation* Program).

The CACB's head office is in Ottawa, Ontario. It adheres to the principles of fairness, transparency, clarity, and ethical business practices in all of its activities.

By agreement of the licensing authorities (the councils of nine provincial institutes and associations), the CACB was established in 1976 to assess and certify the academic qualifications of individuals holding a professional degree or diploma in architecture who intended to apply for registration. In 1991, the CACB mandate to certify degree credentials was reaffirmed, and its membership was revised to reflect its additional responsibility for accrediting professional degree programs in Canadian university schools of architecture. L'Ordre des Architectes du Québec joined the CACB in 1991 and the Northwest Territories Association of Architects joined in 2001.

Graduation from a CACB-accredited program is the first of three steps (education, experience, and examination) on the path to licensure.

The CACB only accredits *Programs* that are intended by their institution to be professional degrees in architecture that lead to licensure. Professional accreditation of a *Program* means that it has been evaluated by the CACB and substantially meets the educational standards that comprise, as a whole, an appropriate education for an architect.

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

The *Program*s include:

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

In keeping with the principal of outcome-based *Accreditation*, the CACB does not restrict the structure of a professional *Program* and/or the distribution of its coursework.

The accreditation process requires a self-assessment by the institution or *Program*, an evaluation of the self-assessment by the CACB, and a site visit and review conducted by a team representing the CACB.
The process begins at the school with the preparation of the Architecture Program Report (*APR*). The *APR* identifies and defines the program and its various contexts, responding to the *CACB Conditions and Procedures for*

Accreditation. The *APR* is expected to be useful to the planning process of the school, as well as documentation for the purposes of accreditation.

Upon acceptance of the *APR* by the CACB Board, an accreditation visit is scheduled. The CACB's decision on accreditation is based upon the capability of the program to satisfy the Conditions and Procedures for Accreditation, including the ability of its graduating students to meet the requirements for learning as defined in the Student Performance Criteria. During the visit, the team reviews student work and evaluates it against these requirements. The team also assesses the effectiveness and degree of support available to the architectural program through meetings with the institution's administrators at various levels, architecture and other faculty, students, alumni, and local practitioners.

At the conclusion of the visit, the Visiting Team makes observations and expresses compliments and concerns about the program and its components. It also offers suggestions for program enrichment and makes recommendations, which, in the judgment of the team, are necessary for the program's improvement and continuing re-accreditation. Following the visit, the team writes the following VTR, which is forwarded with a confidential recommendation to the CACB. The CACB then makes a final decision regarding the term of accreditation.

Terms of Accreditation

Term for Initial Accreditation

*Program*s seeking initial *accreditation* must first be granted candidacy status. The maximum period of candidacy status is six years.

*Program*s that achieve initial *accreditation* at any time during the six-year candidacy will receive an initial three-year term, indicating that all major program components and resources are in place. Some additional program development may be necessary and/or deficiencies may need to be corrected. Additionally, to be eligible for CACB certification, students cannot have graduated from the *Program* more than two years prior to the initial *accreditation*.

Terms for Continuing Accreditation

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

b) Six-year term with a "focused evaluation" at the end of three years: Indicates that significant deficiencies exist in meeting the requirements of the CACB Conditions and Terms for Accreditation; consideration of these deficiencies will form the basis of a focused evaluation. The *Program* is required to report on its particular deficiencies during the third year.

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

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

be revoked. If the two-year probationary term is following the sequence described in "c," the *Program* must receive at least a six-year term or its *accreditation* shall be revoked.

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

Term for Reinstated Accreditation

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

II. Summary of Team Findings

1. Team's General Comments

University: The Azrieli School of Architecture & Urbanism is valued by the upper administration of Carleton University and has been identified as playing a critical role in the strategic plan, specifically regarding sustainability and wellness. Both the President and Provost expressed their appreciation of the new Director and the architectural programs' alignment with the vision, goals, and objectives of the university.

Faculty: The faculty at the Azrieli School of Architecture & Urbanism draw from a diversity of backgrounds bringing their expertise and research to studios and coursework. The recent faculty hires and new leadership have enriched the faculty complement. They serve as catalysts for new teaching perspectives, research foci, and initiatives. The new model of faculty loading benefits the school through additional faculty research initiatives.

Students: The students in the ASAU are engaged with initiatives beyond those bound by the curriculum. This is impressive as students transition into their post-pandemic education. Students are active members of the school community from design-builds and outreach activities to internal endeavors for exhibition and student well-being.

The Facilities: The labs and the specialized fabrication equipment are available to students and research projects. They contribute and complement the students' ability to explore and craft architectural concepts within the curriculum. Students and Faculty praise the Support Staff within the workshop and IT departments and are indispensable to the school.

Technological Resources: The School of Architecture benefits from a diverse range of tools and methods that provide students and faculty opportunities to advance design and research. From its robust array of digital and conventional tools in the workshop, to access to advanced modeling and simulation tools in the two CAD labs and the CIMS facility, the technologies available to the school mobilize its students for contemporary and future praxis.

Urbanism Focus: Urban design is a strength. This is evident in the student design work and the quality of the urban response and map-making.

Community Engagement: The school is an active stakeholder on campus, in Ottawa, and globally, including groups ranging from the NCC to Ottawa Community Housing (Architecture Action Lab). Studios and workshops with stakeholders provide students with meaningful Indigenous and global perspectives on design. As a result, the school has a robust series of opportunities for active engagement and experiential learning.

Student Experiential Learning: The school provides students with a range of experiential opportunities including work on funded research (a remarkably high number of student work study positions), cooperative education experience (currently at 70 students annually), and mobility (the Directed Studies Abroad program). These are well-supported by the school staff, faculty, and funding.

2. Conditions for Accreditation "met" and "not met": a summary

	Met	Not Met
1. Program Self-Assessment	☑	☐
2. Public Information	☑	☐
3. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion	☑	☐
4. Student Composition, Well-Being, and Enrichment	☑	☐
5. Faculty and Staff Resources	☑	☐
6. Space and Technology Resources	☐	☑
7. Information Resources	☑	☐
8. Financial Resources	☑	☐
9. Administrative Structure	☑	☐
10. Professional Degrees and Curriculum	☑	☐
11.1. Program Performance Criteria (PPC)		
1. Professional development	☑	☐
2. Design education	☐	☑
3. Global perspectives and environmental stewardship	☑	☐
4. Collaboration, leadership, and community engagement	☑	☐
5. Technical knowledge	☑	☐
6 Breadth of education	☑	☐
11.2. Student Performance Criteria		
A. Design		
A1. Design Theories, Precedents, and Methods	☑	☐
A2. Design Skills	☑	☐
A3. Design Tools	☑	☐
A4. Program Analysis	☑	☐
A5. Site Context and Design	☑	☐
A6. Urban Design	☑	☐
A7. Detail Design	☑	☐
A8. Design Documentation	☑	☐
B. Culture, Communications, and Critical Thinking		
B1. Critical Thinking and Communication	☑	☐
B2. Architectural History	☑	☐
B3. Architectural Theory	☑	☐
B4. Cultural Diversity and Global Perspectives	☑	☐
B5. Ecological Systems	☑	☐
C. Technical Knowledge		
C1. Regulatory Systems	☑	☐
C2. Materials	☑	☐
C3. Structural Systems	☑	☐
C4. Envelope Systems	☑	☐
C5. Environmental Systems	☐	☑

D. Comprehensive Design		
D1. Comprehensive Design	☑	☐
E: Profession al Practice		
E1. The Architectural Profession	☑	☐
E2. Ethical and Legal Responsibilities	☑	☐
E3. Modes of Practice	☑	☐
E4. Professional Contracts	☑	☐
E5. Project Management	☐	☑

3. Program's Progress since the previous site visit (from previous VTR)

Program's vision, goals and objectives.
This is no longer a concern

Human resources and human resources development – Faculty
This is no longer a concern

Human resources and human resources development – Students
This is no longer a concern

Physical Resources
This remains a concern. Some items have been addressed

4. Program Strengths

University: The Azrieli School of Architecture & Urbanism is valued by the upper administration of Carleton University and has been identified as playing a critical role in the strategic plan, specifically regarding sustainability and wellness. Both the President and Provost expressed their appreciation of the new Director and the architectural programs' alignment with the vision, goals, and objectives of the university.

Faculty: The faculty at the Azrieli School of Architecture & Urbanism draw from a diversity of backgrounds bringing their expertise and research to studios and coursework. The recent faculty hires and new leadership have enriched the faculty complement. They serve as catalysts for new teaching perspectives, research foci, and initiatives. The new model of faculty loading benefits the school through additional faculty research initiatives.

Students: The students in the ASAU are engaged with initiatives beyond those bound by the curriculum. This is impressive as students transition into their post-pandemic education. Students are active members of the school community from design-builds and outreach activities to internal endeavors for exhibition and student well-being.

The Facilities: The labs and the specialized fabrication equipment are available to students and research projects. They contribute and complement the students' ability to explore and craft architectural concepts within the curriculum. Students and Faculty praise the Support Staff within the workshop and IT departments and are indispensable to the school.

Technological Resources: The School of Architecture benefits from a diverse range of tools and methods that provide students and faculty opportunities to advance design and research. From its robust array of digital and conventional tools in the workshop, to access to advanced modeling and simulation tools in the two CAD labs and the CIMS facility, the technologies available to the school mobilize its students for contemporary and future praxis.

Urbanism Focus: Urban design is a strength. This is evident in the student design work and the quality of the urban response and map-making.

Community Engagement: The school is an active stakeholder on campus, in Ottawa, and globally, including groups ranging from the NCC to Ottawa Community Housing (Architecture Action Lab).

Studios and workshops with stakeholders provide students with meaningful Indigenous and global perspectives on design. As a result, the school has a robust series of opportunities for active engagement and experiential learning.

Student Experiential Learning: The school provides students with a range of experiential opportunities including work on funded research (a remarkably high number of student work study positions), cooperative education experience (currently at 70 students annually), and mobility (the Directed Studies Abroad program). These are well-supported by the school staff, faculty, and funding.

5. Causes of Concern and Team's recommendations

[1] Although the school values the current building, its many assets and architectural qualities, the issue of equitable access of the building is an ongoing concern. There is no direct elevator access to the 5th floor, and the existing elevator is unreliable. The concept of equitable access includes the physical isolation of the 5th floor studios from the broader student community, hampering the opportunity of peer-to-peer learning.
This concern has persisted as noted in previous Visiting Team Reports. More broadly, the team encourages the Faculty and University to establish a clear timeline for remediation and renewal of the building.

[2] The Team notes that information about the Program streams (Design, Conservation & Sustainability, and Urbanism) is clear. However, the transitions and paths from the Program streams into the M.Arch Program are not clearly understood by students.

[3] The integration of the Building Technology curriculum into Design studios is insufficient. Student work from the studios lack integration of environmental and life safety systems. This has been noted in the previous accreditation visits. Although standalone technology courses address most SPCs, there is an issue with their sequencing. Often, basic Building Technology principles are absent from advanced studio work.

[4] The team observed noticeable differences in level of competencies among students involving acumen, integration, and proficiency of design tools. This is detailed in the report starting with PPC2 Design Education.

III. Compliance with the Conditions for Accreditation

1. Program Self-assessment
The program must provide an assessment of the degree to which it is fulfilling its mission and achieving its action plan.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
The program utilizes standardized mechanisms such as NSSE scores and various internal processes established in the past two years to gather input from diverse stakeholders, including students, contract instructors, and Indigenous groups. Various committees and action plans address insights from this comprehensive assessment, expanding the scale and scope of Program self-assessment.

2. Public Information
The Program must provide clear, complete, and accurate information to the public and include the following text in its official Program information.

"In Canada, the Canadian Architectural Certification Board (CACB) is the sole agency authorized by the Canadian Architectural Licensing Authorities (CALA) to accredit Canadian professional degree programs in architecture for the purposes of architectural licensure."

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
The CACB accreditation process and collection of work is well-documented in the course content, outlines, assignments, website, and other channels.

3. Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion
The Program must conform to provincial and institutional policies that augment and clarify the provisions of the Charter of Rights and Freedoms as they apply to social equity. Policies in place that are specific to the school or professional Program should be clearly stated, as well as the means by which the policies are communicated to current and prospective faculty, students, and staff.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
The program demonstrates a commitment to social equity by actively hiring from equity-deserving groups, implementing EDI policies (Kinamagawin, EDI policy, Accessibility Plan), and integrating social equity into course structures and assignments. This is a Program strength

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 boasts a diverse student population, well-supported by provisions such as the ASAU Student Well-Being Committee. Although international enrollment is modest, exposure to diverse cultures is facilitated through studios abroad, co-op opportunities, field trips, and community engagement. There is a robust support program offered by the Student Experience Office.

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 achieves a balanced workload of teaching, administration, and research, addressing previous concerns. Equal gender distribution, transparent reporting, and diverse faculty backgrounds contribute to an enriched learning environment.
Faculty expressed concern about scheduling workshop facilities, the number of faculty in the Conservation and Sustainability stream, and space for scholarly and research work.

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** ☑

Physical Resources The report outlines recent improvements and additions to the Architecture Building, including design studio spaces, lecture rooms, seminar rooms, faculty offices, project review areas, exhibition spaces, washrooms, ventilation, and skylights. This indicates attention to the overall physical environment of the building. It also mentions studies aimed at building renewal and improvement.
However, there is no equitable access to the fifth-floor addition. This has been a concern of accreditation teams for at least twelve years.

Equitable Access The APR highlights efforts to improve accessibility, including upgrades to access ramps, gender-inclusive bathrooms, and plans for accessible routes to different floors. These measures provide a level of access but without an elevator to the fifth floor the building does not provide equitable access for all students, faculty, and staff within the building. The concept of equitable access includes the physical isolation of the fifth-floor studios from the broader student community, hampering their access to peer-to-peer learning.

Workshop and Fabrication Resources The APR describes resources available in workshops and fabrication labs, including equipment, infrastructure, and staff support. While there are reports of problems with student access, the resources are particularly good, the staff is essential, and the workshops and labs are well used.

Information Technology The report discusses computer facilities, including computer labs, hardware specifications, software licenses, and networking infrastructure. The resources are good.

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 APR describes the library, including its collections, services, facilities, equipment, and its budget, administrative structure, and operations. There is an architectural librarian, and engineering and design specialist. The library is proactive, and policies and acquisitions are constantly updated. The information resources are reacting and adapting to digital and remote-work models.

8. Financial Resources

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

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

As discussed in 3.6, ASAU has not been provided with sufficient funding for an upgraded and updated building. We have seen no financial response to their requests for major renovations.
In all other accounts, ASAU has adequate funding for most of their programs and has been involved in fund raising. Nevertheless, there are some ongoing issues with resources that are beginning to impact the Program's operating budget such as a widening shortfall in salary for contract instructors.

9. Administrative Structure (Academic Unit & Institution)

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

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

The ASAU operates within the Faculty of Engineering and Design (FED), enjoying a unique hybrid structure where administrative oversight is by the FED Dean, and academic matters are directly reported by the ASAU to Senate. This autonomy allows the Program's Director to oversee various aspects such as program management, IT, and workshop support, as illustrated in its organizational chart.

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 APR outlines the various pathways the Program achieves an accredited professional degree according to the CACB Conditions and Terms. However, this information is not well understood by students within the various bachelor streams, or by incoming students into M.Arch I.

There are initiatives underway to align the bachelor streams with the M.Arch advanced placement but this will take time to implement.

In the interim, there is a need to improve communications to promote understanding of the application criteria for advanced placement, including the implications of selecting each ASAU under-graduate stream.

11. Performance Criteria

The Program must demonstrate satisfactory performance in relation to program performance criteria (PPC), and student performance criteria (SPC) as detailed below. The CACB does not specify the structure and content of educational programs nor the forms of evidence used to satisfy the criteria. Programs are therefore encouraged to develop unique learning and teaching strategies, methods, and materials to satisfy these criteria.

For PPCs, evidence of performance may take many diverse forms not limited to course work and its outcomes. The Program must describe and demonstrate that it creates an environment in which these criteria are satisfied.

For SPCs, evidence of performance must include student work and the pedagogical objectives and assignments of any given course. With respect to fulfilling the criteria, the Program must demonstrate that all of its graduates have achieved, at minimum, a satisfactory level of accomplishment.

The roster of six PPCs and twenty-four SPCs is intended to foster an integrated approach to learning. Their order is not intended to imply a weight assigned to each.

11.1 Program Performance Criteria

The Program must provide its students with a well-thought-out curriculum with educational opportunities that include general studies, professional studies, and elective studies.
Each of the PPCs must be addressed in a clear narrative statement and with reference to any relevant supporting documentation.

PPC 1. Professional Development

The Program must demonstrate its approach to engaging with the profession and exposing students to a breadth of professional opportunities and career paths, including the transition to internship and licensure.

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

The APR demonstrates the Program's engagement with the profession and the ways students are exposed to contemporary practice through lecture series and public exhibitions, as well as student participation in co-op and study abroad opportunities.

PPC 2. Design Education

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

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

Design studio is at the curriculum's core. It is the location to apply technical, history & theory, and professional practice courses.
The program should increase and improve ways of connecting and applying design theory and research methods throughout the curriculum (see SPC A1 and A2). In addition, there are concerns about programing and site context (see SPCs A4 and A5) as well as the application of technical knowledge (see PPC5, A3, A7 and A8), While the Program complies with most of the SPCs, this remains a general concern best captured in this criterion.

PPC 3. Global Perspectives and Environmental Stewardship
The Program must demonstrate how it embraces the diverse contexts that define contemporary architecture, including local, global, and environmental interests.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
The Program engages with local communities (including housing providers, immigrant communities, and Indigenous groups) through studios, workshops, and faculty research. It fosters global perspectives through international exchange programs, study trips, and collaborations, providing students with an understanding of broadened architectural contexts. The curriculum incorporates environmental considerations, addressing climate change and sustainability, while embracing equity, diversity and inclusion initiatives in both curriculum and events.

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 achieves a well-rounded pedagogical approach through interdisciplinary collaboration in comprehensive studios attracting other University majors. One-third of all studio projects are connected to real communities or actual projects, involving local civic and international partners. There are regular events such as design-builds by Action Lab and communications with various stakeholders that further enhance engagement beyond the ASAU.

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** ☐
Overall, the program attempts to develop students' technical skills progressively. The outcomes of comprehensive studios in both the BAS & M.Arch program try to consolidate the various streams of architectural technology through close integration with students' design investigation. However, the student work does not consistently demonstrate that technical knowledge is woven into the core design studio curriculum. Technical understanding is not evident in some of the student work presented for review, both in the high and low pass categories. (See SPCs A3 and A7)

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

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
The Program streams (design, urbanism, heritage, sustainability) present the students with multi-disciplinary learning opportunities, broadening their learning horizon and encouraging well-rounded perspectives on architecture and design. However, it is not clear how many elective courses are available to BAS students. Students reported that many courses in the University calendar were no longer taught.

11.2. Student Performance Criteria

A. Design

A1. Design Theories, Precedents, and Methods
The student must demonstrate an ability to articulate a design process grounded in theory and practice, an understanding of design principles and methods, and the critical analysis of architectural precedents.

Visiting Team Assessment: **Met** ☑ **Not Met** ☐
Only some of the required content is taught and there is little explicit application in the studio. See SPC A2 below. This concern relates to PPC2 Design Education

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** ☐
Precedents are evident in Masters ARCS5031 assignment 2 (care facility) and more generally in some studios. However, more evidence is needed to show that design is grounded in theory and there is explicit attention to process and methods in the design studio. There are concerns about the application of SPCs B2 and B3 (for instance, Arch5020 assignments are written only). This concern also relates to PPC2 Design Education**.**

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** ☐
The use of a range of design tools and techniques is evident, however there is a dramatic disparity in the student work. There is software access and experimentation with visualization. There is little course content in modelling (including BIM) and imaging software beyond the second year of the BAS and for those students entering the three-year M.Arch program. This concern relates to PPC2 Design Education.

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** ☐
While program analyses are present in various studio courses, there is only a moderate ability to respond to complex, heterogeneous programs. This concern relates to PPC2 Design Education.

A5. Site Context and Design

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

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

Students are exposed to techniques of analysis responding to local Ottawa sites and to shared sites or within collaborative projects. However, much independent student design work lacks application of regulatory contexts and thorough analysis of climate and ecological systems. This concern relates to PPC2 Design Education.

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** ☐

It is evident that students can analyze and respond to large urban sites, map development patterns, and basic regulatory instruments that govern context. This is a program strength and is consistently demonstrated across all streams and years.

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** ☐

In the various technical courses, the students demonstrate some ability to articulate architectural concepts through detailing. However, there appears to be a disconnect between the integration of technical knowledge and design investigation. The prevalence of physical models in studio explorations and presentation material points to an intuitive understanding of material interfaces and assemblies. Many SPCs are covered in only one or two courses and many assignments allow groups of six students to complete the assignments. This concern relates to PPC2 Design Education.

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** ☐

While there is no introductory drawing or modelling course in the three-year M.Arch curriculum, overall, the student work shows an ability to express architectural and technical concepts through various media including diagrams, drawings, and physical models. Nevertheless, there is disparity shown in examples of student work. This concern relates to PPC2 Design Education.

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** ☐

The independent study and thesis work demonstrates an ability to write and use visual media to effectively communicate research. The three foundation courses (1000, 4002, and 5020) provide an effective base for thesis work covering land-based ownership, ethical obligations of the built environment, and community power dynamics. Most coursework is written, without demonstrating application to design work.

B2. Architectural History

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

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

The program adeptly addresses a cross-section of cultural assets in both Western and non-Western perspectives. It fosters an understanding of the synthesis and evolution of architecture and urban design through cultural, political, technological, and ecological lenses. However, the required courses of ARCH5010 and ARCH5020 appear insufficient without common learning objectives in the elective sections of ARCH5200 and ARCH5201. The application of architectural history in design is a concern. This concern relates to PPC2 Design Education.

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** ☐

Students demonstrate a foundational understanding of conceptual and theoretical frameworks in architecture and urban design. The graduate coursework goes beyond the conventional cannon and encourages students to look to Indigenous and non-Western thought on architecture. As addressed in A1, application of architectural theory is a concern. This concern relates to PPC2 Design Education.

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** ☐

ASAU has provided a wide, well-thought-out variety of topics within their studio courses for students to see, understand and broaden their cultural perspective. This is a program strength.

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** ☐

Many courses, tutorials, and projects show ecological materials, details, and systems. Student work in ARCS5105 demonstrates critical thinking, integrates their projects with site ecology, and explores the role of the built environment within the natural environment.

C. Technical Knowledge

C1. Regulatory Systems

The student must have an understanding of the applicable building codes, regulations, and standards for a given building and site, including universal design standards and the principles that inform the design and selection of life-safety systems.

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

While analysis skills are strong in isolated assignments, execution of such knowledge is not always present in design coursework.

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** ☐

The Architectural Technology courses develop a keen sense of materials that complement design courses such as ARCS5105 and ARCC5100. Ideas about materials are applied frequently, and at distinct stages, in design projects.

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** ☐

There is evidence of an understanding of fundamental structural behaviour present in course work. However, the evidence provided was a result of group projects. This obscures the student's individual knowledge, which may be lacking. Some students have difficulty with the application of appropriate structural systems in individual design projects. This concern relates to PPC2 Design Education.

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** ☐

Students have a demonstrated understanding of the principles of detailing and envelope systems including effective assignments pertaining to assembly and costing of envelope systems. Students develop conventional technical knowledge leading to design application in graduate studio work.

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** ☑

Student work in design courses show poor consideration for passive environmental system design, ie louvre placement, passive ventilation design; it is particularly concerning when it occurs in the studio focused on environmental ecology. Renewable technologies, environmental separations of high humidity spaces (greenhouses) are not properly addressed, and overall mechanical requirements to serve intensive indoor plant systems seems

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** ☐

There is a fairly consistent quality on the high pass content across all relevant courses, although some low pass work only marginally meets the criterion, for example, ARCC 5032 low pass projects show considerable weaknesses.
Technology courses in M.Arch1 are non-sequential – ARCC 5099 Building Tech 4 is taken one semester before ARCC 5098 Building Tech 3. Other than a peripheral perspective on construction found in assignment 3 (construction log) for ARCC 2203, students have little meaningful, guided exposure to real world construction environments to help contextualize and cement theoretical course material.
Attention to the concerns noted in PPC2 Design Education will improve the work in the Gateway Studio and develop more comprehensive work across the design studios.

E: Professional Practice

E1. The Architectural Profession

The student must have an understanding of the organization of the profession, the Architects Act(s) and its regulations, the role of regulatory bodies, the paths to licensure including internship, and the reciprocal rights and responsibilities of interns and employers.

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

The single graduate level course (ARCC 5200 - Professional Practice) addresses this performance criteria.

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** ☐

ARCC 5200 - Professional Practice demonstrates an understanding of the ethical issues involved in the formation of professional judgment, architect's legal responsibilities, and the role of advocacy.

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** ☐

There was disparity between low and high passes - suggesting a lack of understanding in one of the two courses addressing this criterion.

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** ☐

In the only course addressing this criterion, contracts are covered in one assignment and two guest lectures. Integrating these concepts over multiple courses could ensure robustness of material coverage.

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** ☑

Met in the BAS with two-year AP M.Arch since it includes Arch 4500, however it is not covered in the three-year M.Arch. ARCC5200 covers many aspects of this criterion but does not cover building economics and cost control strategies and work plans and project schedules.

IV. Appendices

Appendix A: Program Information

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

1- Brief History of the Carleton University

Carleton University's roots as a non-denominational college supported in part by charitable donations from the Ottawa community make it unique among Ontario universities. Founded in 1942, Carleton was created in response to the need to help provide the young people in Ottawa, many of whom had taken on jobs to cope with the pressures of the Depression, with an opportunity to continue their formal education.

From its humble beginnings on Ottawa's First Avenue, Carleton has grown into a dynamic research and teaching institution with a tradition of anticipating and leading change. Today, the university sits on more than 100 acres, on a site between the Rideau River and the Rideau Canal, just a short distance from downtown Ottawa.

The university provides an excellent education and experience to its more than 24,000 full- and part-time students at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Its more than 875 academic staff are recognized internationally for their scholarship and cutting-edge research in more than 50 disciplines.

Carleton's reputation is built on its strengths in the fields of journalism, public affairs, international affairs, architecture and high technology. Its students benefit from the interdisciplinary, active, hands-on approach to teaching and research practiced by its faculty members and from the numerous partnerships the university has with the federal government, other universities and private sector partners. (https://carleton.ca/about/history/)

2- Institutional Mission

The School's long-standing engagement in speculative thinking and material craft, coupled with its commitment to addressing critical societal issues, offers students a range of perspectives on the discipline and the profession. The School's inclusive and diverse approach to education is reflected in its three undergraduate majors (Conservation and Sustainability, Design, Urbanism), its array of graduate degrees (MArch, MAS, GDAC, PhD), and two forthcoming graduate programs – in Adaptive Architecture and in Urban Design. Students benefit from exceptional faculty, several of whom are cross-appointed, and an increasing number of existing and potential opportunities for interdisciplinary studies in areas such as climate change, African studies, accessibility, and community engagement. Research groups and initiatives at ASAU and within the broader university community (e.g., the Kinàmàgawin Report, the EDI Action Plan, University sustainability and accessibility goals), also provide a stimulating framework within which to engage urgent issues. These include the right to housing, social justice, and the relationship of conservation and adaptive reuse to sustainability. Addressing critical societal issues through inclusive education and design – for example in community-engagement studios, design-build projects, funded directed studies abroad opportunities, and collaborative research initiatives – the School is committed to centering active engagement with critical social, political, and environmental concerns, including the climate crisis.
In Ottawa, ASAU has forged ongoing relationships with numerous local and national organizations, including Ottawa Community Housing, the National Capital Commission, Gignul Non-Profit Housing,

and the Canada Lands Company. These collaborations help shape national architectural policies, contribute to a re-thinking of our relationship to the land, and open new potentials for architecture. The number of partnerships and community-engagement projects at ASAU is substantial, with activities that extend internationally through global studios, research partnerships, and scholarly networks. Through collaborative learning and research, ASAU works earnestly to serve and to build trust with diverse communities, near and far. ASAU strives to provide undergraduate, professional, post-professional, and doctoral students a rigorous, imaginative, and accessible education. The aspiration is for students to understand both their responsibilities and agencies as designers and architects, for them to learn to confidently use their disciplinary expertise to work collaboratively with different stakeholders, and to acquire a holistic view of the broader social, technological, and ecological context within which they intervene.

3- Program History

The School of Architecture held its first classes in the fall of 1968, with twelve students and four faculty members. The School offered a five-year undergraduate professional degree, accredited, from the outset, by the Ontario Association of Architects. The first degree was awarded in 1973. During the first few years, faculty ranks increased annually as the student body grew. By 1976 the School comprised five Full Professors, eleven Associate Professors, five Assistant Professors, and fifteen Sessional Lecturers. The School expanded further in the 1970s, reaching 300 students and 24 faculty members by 1983. The academic staff was supplemented by a technical staff comprised of a Photographic Supervisor and a Library Technician.

From 1968 to 1978, the curriculum for the 5-year B.Arch. was comprised of thirty credits. This curriculum was organized around five “Divisions”: Division A focused on history and theory, human sciences, and environmental sciences; Division B concerned structures, environmental controls, materials and methods of construction, and design economics; Division C addressed general planning, policy planning and community development, management and development, and professional practice; Division D was dedicated to computations, design methodology, design education, and communications; and, lastly, the Studio Division. At the time, nearly 50% of coursework was free electives (14.5 of 30 credits). In the Studio, the first two years were foundation years focusing on basic design, problem solving, construction, planning, environmental factors, and context. Studios in years three and four were defined by building types, which students could take in any order. Colloquia, which were required every semester carried the humanities portion of the program and were defined thematically. Workshops were considered to be intermediary between course subject areas and the design theatre of the Studios—an opportunity for the Studio mode of teaching and learning to be applied to selected subsets of problems.

While this initial program was under continuous revision, it remained essentially in place until the retirement of the School’s first Director, Professor Shadbolt. The first major program overhaul came in 1978, under Director Michael Coote. Colloquia were replaced by seven mandatory Theories of Environmental Design courses, dealing with the history and theory of architecture and linking architecture to culture. The Design Studios became sequential from years one through four, each a prerequisite for the next, so that a more finely tuned progression through the years could be developed. The next significant program revision took place in 1980, when the first year of the Studio program was radically transformed to encourage students to develop a design skillset and sensibility conceptually grounded in thoughtful making. This was an important development of the program, and speculative making continues to be at the core of the current curriculum. At the same time, the free elective portion of the program was reduced with the introduction of Theories Electives, which required

that the majority of electives be taken from a list of courses emphasizing the theory and history of architecture.

The next major change in the program came with the appointment of Professor Alberto Perez-Gomez as Director in 1984. The commitment to 'thoughtful making' was given a more rigorous philosophical grounding and extended to all levels of studio instruction. The studio work resulting from this thrust has given the School an international presence. The major structural reorganization at this time focused on creating options for a culminating fifth-year project (Design Studio 5A, Research Thesis, or Design Thesis), allowing students tremendous flexibility in choosing the final work best suited to their strengths and personal interests. Great emphasis was placed on the intellectual basis of design, the poetic power of form, and academic scholarship in Research and Design Theses. The impressive work produced in the fifth-year program has had an impact on nearly every aspect of the program. The Senate of the University approved another set of program revisions in 1992, during Professor Benjamin Gianni's term as Director. These assured that students would cover courses more directly concerned with the profession in the lower years. While the previous sequential structure of the Studio program remained intact, the content of design projects evolved toward a greater emphasis on building design, site development, context, and planning as the media through which the conceptual emphasis of first year found its expression in the upper years.

In 1993, a proposal for a post-professional M.Arch degree program was approved by the University Senate and the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies. The program began accepting students in the Fall of 1995. The degree was designed to accommodate a variety of emphases under the heading of Design Studies, to promote research in the School, emphasize design as a form of research, and accommodate a range of thesis work. The program was bifurcated into two research foci: Design and Culture and Design and Technology. The first considered questions of history and theory and the second issues of information technology.

In 1997, the School developed a proposal to restructure its 5-year Bachelor of Architecture to a 4-year, preprofessional Bachelor of Architectural Studies (BAS) followed by a 2-year professional Masters of Architecture (M.Arch). The undergraduate component was approved by the University Senate in 1997 and began accepting students in the Fall of 1998. The graduate component was approved by the Ontario Council of Graduate Studies in 1998 as a variation on the previously approved post-professional M.Arch. The School instituted a formal co-op program in 1999 as an option within the BAS. This option is now well established in all majors of the BAS. The most significant changes since the conception of the program were the development of the Directed Research Studio (DRS), a short duration (1-3 weeks) undergraduate Directed Studies Abroad (DSA option in the third year of the BAS, and a full-term DSA in the first year of the M.Arch.

The most recent and significant shifts began in 2009, as the school instituted 3 new majors at the undergraduate level and a 3-year M.Arch (Professional) degree. Beginning in 2009, students were able to access undergraduate BAS programs with majors in Design, Conservation & Sustainability, and Urbanism. At the graduate level, students with 4-year honours degrees (but without previous architectural studies), were admitted to a new M.Arch curriculum. This newest program, reviewed and accredited by a Focused Evaluation in 2013, is increasingly popular and shows a great potential for increased enrolment.
With these measures, the student population continued to grow and diversify. At the time of the 2004 program review, when the school was shifting from the 5-year B.Arch to the 4+2 structure, there were a total of 285 BAS students, 51 B.Arch students, and 40 M.Arch (post professional) students making the total population of the School 376. The 2010 APR reported a total student population of 359. In

2016, that number had increased to 464. This reflects the fact that since 2010, the school has increased its 1st year undergraduate intake from 72 to 92 in response to the restructured BAS program with three majors. The M.Arch (professional) has also increased its 1st year intake from 28 in 2009 to 58 in 2016 with the introduction of the new 3-year professional M.Arch. Since these changes, the total school population has remained between 460 and 500, amongst the largest architecture programs in Canada.

The greatest changes over the past few decades are the creation of a doctoral program under the directorship of Prof. Marco Frascari, the development of new proposed graduate programs at the graduate levels (Masters of Urban Design and Masters of Adaptive Architecture), as well as the development special programs for outreach (Studio First, and Imagine Architecture). Both these initiatives were undertaken under the leadership of Prof. Jill Stoner.

Directorship:
The founding Director, Douglas Shadbolt, completed two full terms of office and retired in 1978. He was replaced by Professor Michael Coote. Professor James Strutt served as Acting Director in 1983-84 following the tragic death of Professor Coote. Professor Alberto Perez-Gomez served as Director from 1983 to 1986, followed by Professor Robert Osler as Acting Director for one year. Professor Gilbert Sutton then held the office through 1991. Professor Stanley Loten served as Acting Director in 1991/92 while a search was conducted for a new Director. Benjamin Gianni was appointed in 1992 for a five-year term and re-appointed in 1997 for another 2.5 years. In 1999, Professor Gulzar Haider became Director until his retirement in 2004. In July of 2004, Professor Stephen Fai was appointed for a one-year term while an external search was conducted resulting in the appointment of Marco Frascari as Director of the School. During Prof. Frascari's protracted illness and following his untimely death, Prof. Sheryl Boyle assumed an extended interim directorship while a new Director search was held. In 2015, Prof. Jill Stoner joined the school and completed a full-term as Director. On the completion of Prof. Jill Stoner's five-year term, from July 2021 to December 2022, Prof. Federica Goffi held the role of interim director. In January 2023, Prof. Anne Bordeleau joined the Azrieli School of Architecture & Urbanism, with an appointment as Director for a five-year term.

4- Program Mission

ASAU Position Statement (adopted August 2023)
The Azrieli School of Architecture & Urbanism (ASAU) occupies unceded, non-Treaty, Algonquin Anishinaabeg territory. Given our location in the nation's capital, it is all the more important to acknowledge the legacies and atrocities that this occupation implies. To this end, we are committed to transforming our spaces, programs, and practices through honourable and respectful engagement with Indigenous peoples, land-based knowledges, and holistic approaches to architectural and urban design.

ASAU is working to reframe its tradition of speculative thinking and projective making to better engage critical social, political, and environmental concerns, expressly including the climate emergency. Our aspiration, when advancing design education and research, is to work responsibly and creatively at the intersection of architecture, conservation, and urbanism, while remaining cognizant of the capacity of design both to enrich and to threaten communities, cultures, and ecologies. We strive to provide our undergraduate, professional, post-professional, and doctoral students with a rigorous, imaginative, and accessible education. Upholding bold and collaborative learning and research, we work earnestly to serve and to build trust with diverse communities, near and far.

5- Program Action Plan

The Azrieli School of Architecture and Urbanism's Action Plan is organised around the three strategic directions set out in the 2020 Carleton University Strategic Integrated Plan, and around which the 2023 Carleton Academic Plan is structured. These are as follows: (1) "Share Knowledge, Shape the Future", (2) "Strive for Wellness, Strive for Sustainability", and (3) "Serve Ottawa, Serve the World". Within ASAU's plan, each of these directions is further defined through a series of objectives that respond to the school's unique strengths, challenges and priorities as identified through the self-assessment and planning process (see section 3.1 'Program Self-Assessment').

Reinforcing Carleton University's (CU) goal to "Share Knowledge, Shape the Future", ASAU's first set of objectives supports an opening and rethinking of the design disciplines while maintaining the rigour and critical role of design education. Building on the different pathways and on the multiple existing and prospective programs across the Undergraduate (Conservation and Sustainability, Design, Urbanism) and Graduate levels (Architecture, Urban Design and Adaptive Architecture), these objectives are broadly summarized as an aspiration to "Broaden Access to Design's Expanded Roles". Developing a framework that better promotes emerging faculty's expertise, collaborative specializations, more inclusive practices and pedagogical shifts already underway at ASAU and Carleton University, a second group of objectives support ASAU's aspiration to "Orient Teaching, Research and Operations towards Climate and Collective Wellbeing", reinforcing CU's goal to "Strive for Wellness, Strive for Sustainability".

Finally, in line with the University's goal to "Serve Ottawa, Serve the World", and building upon ASAU's ongoing community-based work and extensive collaborations in Ottawa, across Canada, and around the world through Directed Studies Abroad (DSAs) and scholarly networks, a third group of objectives supports an aspiration to "Uphold and Practice Architecture and Urbanism for Public Interest, Locally and Globally".

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

MEMBERS OF THE VISITING TEAM

VOTING MEMBERS

Ted (Edwin) Cavanagh — **Educator** — **CHAIR**

DALHOUSIE SCHOOLS OF ARCHITECTURE
5410 Spring Garden Rd, Halifax, NS B3J 1B6
Cell: (902) 757-0201
Email : ecavanag@dal.com

Elizabeth Mackenzie — Practitioner
UBC School of Architecture
6333 Memorial Rd #402,
Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1Z2
Tel: (604) 731-9157
Email : emack@shaw.ca

Meghan Lamb — Practitioner
44, Kingston Crescent
Dartmouth
NS B3A 2M2
Cell: (902) 240-6004
Email: meghanlamb219@gmail.com

Vincent Hui — Educator
Toronto Metropolitan University
325 Church St
Toronto, ON M5B 2M2
Cell: (416) 669-866
Email: 'vincent.hui@torontomu.ca'

Patrick Benjamin Lefebvre — Intern
DIALOG
100, 10237-104 Street NW
Edmonton, AB T5J 1B1
Cell : (587) 987 4239
Email: patrickpblefebvre@gmail.com

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Peter Osborne — Educator
GEC Architecture.
#310, 14055 West Block Drive NW
Edmonton T5N 1L8
Cell: (780) 566-1443
Email: peter.osborne@gecarchitecture.com

Mohammed al Riffai
Practitioner
Moriyama Teshima | ARCHITECTS
109 Murray St
Ottawa, K1N5M5
Cell: (613) 2555-737
Email: momo@mtarch.com

OBSERVERS

David Theodore — Educator
Peter Guo-hua Fu School of Architecture
McGill University
815 Rue Sherbrooke O,
Montréal, QC H3A 0C2
Cell: (514) 398-6706
Email: david.theodore@mcgill.ca

Appendix C: The Visit Agenda

CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL CERTIFICATION BOARD
CONSEIL CANADIEN DE CERTIFICATION EN ARCHITECTURE

1 rue Nicholas Street, Suite 710
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 7B7
613-241-8399
www.cacb-ccca.ca

Hybrid Visit Agenda Calendar

Carleton University: Site 01-05, March 2024

This Agenda gives a framework for ordering the visit in a timely manner. The order of these items may vary, and additional items may be scheduled at the discretion of the Team Chair.

Virtual Pre-Visit Planning

50 days in advance **Student Work access** **January 11th, 2024** **Readiness for the visit**	_ 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 _ The Team Chair and Program Head determine whether the program is ready for the visit
Meeting #1 **January 19th, 2024** **Process Overview**	_ The Team Chair provides expectations for how the team will work, and makes review assignments The Visiting Team review ACR-A (APR), CACB Conditions and Procedures, and visit protocols, and identify missing materials
Meeting #2 **February 2nd, 2024** **38-40** days in advance **Review and discussions**	_ Individual team member responses to PPCs presented to team _ Discussion and resolution if possible. _ Prioritize any questions to be addressed either in interviews with administrators and department head or during the site visit. _ Team members undertake to redraft PPC as entry to draft VTR for next meeting.
Meeting #3 **February 16th, 2024** **28-30** days in advance **Documentary Review and questions**	☐ **1:00 - 1:30 pm:** Entrance meeting Librarian and possibly staff (eg. technical, financial and human resources). ☐ **1:45 - 2:45 pm:** The Visiting Team reviews the results of the PPC, finalizes questions about PPCs to be addressed during the site visit, and identify any other areas of inquiry. ☐ **2:45 - 3:30 pm:** The Program Head and Faculty performs a walkthrough of the student work compilation for the Visiting Team (intro SPC)

CANADIAN ARCHITECTURAL CERTIFICATION BOARD
CONSEIL CANADIEN DE CERTIFICATION EN ARCHITECTURE

1 rue Nicholas Street, Suite 710
Ottawa, Ontario
K1N 7B7
613-241-8399
www.cacb-ccca.ca

The Visit

Thursday (Virtual)		☐ Team Deliberations and Launch of draft ACR-B
Friday, March 1, 2024 (Virtual) **1:00 – 3:00 pm**	**AM**	☐ **10:00 am** Entrance meeting with the Program Head with the University President and/or Provost (Chief Academic Officer) ☐ **11:00 am**: Entrance meeting with the Dean
	PM	☐ Individual team member responses to SPCs presented to team. ☐ Discussion and resolution if possible. ☐ Prioritize any questions to be addressed either in interviews with faculty and department head during the site visit. ☐ Team members undertake to redraft SPC as entry to draft VTR for Sunday evening meeting
Saturday, March 2, 2024		☐ Day off (or Travel)
Sunday March 3 , 2024 (On-Site)	**AM**	☐ The Visiting Team's arrival and check-in at the hotel
	PM	☐ **4:30 – 6:00 pm**: The Program Head and all faculty perform a walkthrough of the student work compilation for the visiting team (Tour of facilities tbd) ☐ **6:30 pm:** Team entrance meeting with program head ☐ **7:30: 9:00pm:** Team-only Dinner ☐ **9:00 – 10:30 pm:** *Debriefing session and development of draft ACR-B (VTR)*
Monday, March 4 , 2024 (On-Site)	**AM**	☐ **7:30 – 9 am** at School: Team working breakfast at hotel ☐ **9:30 – 9:45 am**: Entrance meeting with all faculty and staff ☐ **10:30 – 11:15 am:** Tour of facilities ☐ **11:30 – 12:15 am** Entrance Meeting with Students Body (The Pit)
	PM	☐ **12:15 – 1:00 pm:** Lunch Meeting with the Student Representatives UG/GRAD/PhD Noon to ☐ **1:15 - 4 pm**: Observation of Studios + Observations of Lectures (provide schedule) ☐ **4:30 pm:** Possible meeting with Union Representative (Inderbir Riar) ☐ **6:30 pm:** Team-only dinner catered at hotel ☐ **6:30 – 9 am:** Debriefing session, re-draft of ACR-B (VTR) and draft of Strengths and Causes of Concern
Tuesday, March 5 , 2024 (On-Site)	**AM**	☐ **8:00 – 8:45 am:** Team Breakfast with the Program head at school ☐ Possible observations of Lectures (provide schedule) ☐ Possible follow-up meeting (with Faculty, students, director, and staff, as needed) ☐ **10:00 – 12:00:** Team deliberations ☐ **12:00 – 1:00 pm:** Team-only lunch at school, Final deliberations and vote
	PM	☐ **2:00 pm**: Exit meeting with Program Head (Director) and with the Dean ☐ **3:00 pm**: Exit meeting with University President (or designate) and Provost ☐ Check out from the hotel and Travel home at their leisure

V. Report Signatures

DocuSigned by:
824AF01C243A4FD...

Ted Edwin Cavanagh, *Chair*
representing the educators

DocuSigned by:
EE6D4E5F6D2540C...

Elizabeth Mackenzie
representing the practitioners

DocuSigned by:
1E239DF474844D2...

Meghan Lamb
representing the interns

DocuSigned by:
9FF55B19001A4E0...

Vincent Hui
representing the educators

DocuSigned by:
1B32C33EB17C407...

Patrick Benjamin Lefebvre.
representing the Interns

DocuSigned by:
C19280B7[illegible]

Peter Osborne
CACB non-voting member

DocuSigned by:
A31124833EAD4DE...

Mohammed Al Riffa.
School non-voting member

This page is intentionally left blank