

CANADIAN SOCIETY OF LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTS

MANUAL OF ACCREDITATION
STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES
FOR CANADIAN PROGRAMS OF LANDSCAPE
ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION



CSLA Accreditation Council | LAAC

AAPC Conseil d'agrément | CAAP

www.csla-aapc.ca

Table of Contents:

1.0	Landscape Architecture Accreditation Council – Overview.....	1
1.1	Mission.....	1
1.2	Mandate.....	1
1.3	Scope	2
1.4	Values	2
1.5	Definitions and Interpretations	2
1.6	Related Accreditation Documentation.....	4
2.0	STANDARDS	5
2.1	Standard One – Program Mission, Goals and Objectives	5
2.2	Standard Two – Program Autonomy, Governance & Administration	6
2.3	Standard Three – Professional Curriculum	6
2.4	Standard Four – Student and Program Outcomes.....	9
2.5	Standard Five – Faculty.....	10
2.6	Standard Six – Community Outreach and Public Service.....	11
2.7	Standard Seven – Facilities, Equipment, Libraries and Technology	12
3.0	Accreditation Procedures and Process.....	13
3.1	Applying for Accreditation	13
3.2	Modified Faculty Requirements for New Programs	13
3.3	Candidacy Status	13
3.4	Self-Evaluation Report	14
3.5	Pre-Visit Sequence of Events and Time Line	14
3.6	Roster of Visiting Evaluators	15
3.7	Visiting Team Selection	15
3.8	Pre-Visit Responsibilities: Visiting Team	16
3.9	Pre-Visit Responsibilities: Program	16
3.10	Sample Visit Schedule	17
3.11	Visiting Team Report.....	19
3.12	Institutional Response.....	19
3.13	Distribution to LAAC Council.....	19
3.14	Withdrawing an Application for Accreditation.....	20
3.15	LAAC Decision Meeting.....	20
3.16	LAAC Actions	20
3.17	Notification of Accreditation Decisions and Actions.....	21
3.18	Confidentiality	21
3.19	Reference to Accredited Status.....	21
3.20	Delaying a scheduled Accreditation Visit.....	22
3.21	Rescheduling Visit	22
3.22	Term of Accreditation	22
3.23	Annual Report.....	22
3.24	Substantive Change.....	23
3.25	Other Reports	23
3.26	Maintaining Good Standing	23
3.27	Administrative Suspension of Accreditation	23
3.28	Withdrawal of Accreditation.....	24
3.29	Document Retention.....	24
3.30	Accreditation Fees	24
4.0	Appeal Procedure	25
4.1	Decisions Subject to Appeal.....	25
4.2	Notice and Basis of Appeal	25
4.3	Appeal Panel	25
4.4	Decision of the Appeal Panel	25
4.5	Expenses of an Appeal.....	25
	Appendix A – Guidelines for the Digital Compendium of Student Work.....	27
	Appendix B – Conflict of Interest Policy and Declaration	29

1.0 Landscape Architecture Accreditation Council – Overview

1.1 Mission

The mission of the Landscape Architecture Accreditation Council (LAAC) is to evaluate, advocate for and advance the quality of education in Canadian landscape architecture programs.

In pursuit of this mission, it is the policy of the Council to ensure a minimum level of achievement of commonly accepted professional skills while encouraging experimentation, innovation and flexibility in curriculum. It is also intended that the LAAC work pro-actively to assist the programs to define their intended learning outcomes, evaluate their programs, and refine their curricula on an on-going basis.

1.2 Mandate

The LAAC has operated continuously since its inception in 1978 as a Standing Committee of the Canadian Society of Landscape Architects (CSLA). The current Bylaws of the Society that define the Accreditation Council's roles and responsibilities are as follows:

- a. Be the body of the Society responsible for accrediting professional university undergraduate and graduate degree programs in landscape architecture;
- b. Comprise six members, appointed by the Board for a normal term of office of five years, and including two landscape architecture educators and one non-landscape architect, with one member being replaced annually;
- c. Elect a Chair whose term of office shall be three years;
- d. Keep funds received for accreditation in an account separate from those of the Society and shall only apply those funds to activities of the Accreditation Council; and
- e. Be responsible for:
 - i. Appointing teams to undertake accreditation;
 - ii. Recruiting and training accreditation team members;
 - iii. Reviewing and approving accreditation team reports;
 - iv. Reviewing and approving annual reports from postsecondary accredited programs;
 - v. Advising the Board of decisions; and,
 - vi. Maintaining contact with the American Society of Landscape Architects' Landscape Architectural Accreditation Board and other accrediting bodies to ensure consistency of standards

Decision-making authority in all accreditation matters rests solely with LAAC, which operates independently of the CSLA and its Component Associations. This authority includes: determination of accreditation standards, policies and procedures; establishment of program fees; and allocation of all accreditation revenues to the achievement of its mission.

The LAAC is designed to be financially self-sustaining; however, it can appeal to the CSLA in the event of funding shortfalls or to undertake special initiatives. The CSLA is also committed to provide in-kind staffing support and overhead for the administration of the LAAC, which typically includes accounting, banking services, meeting planning, record-keeping, Internet/web access, and routine communications with the Association's membership. LAAC members and volunteers are also covered by the applicable CSLA insurance policies

The duties of the Council Chair are: to act as President of the Council; co-ordinate the work of the Council on all accreditation matters; and be responsible for liaison with the CSLA Board of Directors, other accrediting bodies, and the directors of the various Landscape Architecture programs across Canada.

LAAC members must be formally approved by the CSLA Board of Directors and are limited to two consecutive five-year terms without a break in service. Both practitioner and educator members should have served on at least one accreditation visit prior to being appointed to the Board, with consideration also given to diverse experiences and regional representation. Practitioners should have at least 10-years of relevant experience and be a member of CSLA. The non-landscape architecture member of the Council shall be drawn from a related design or planning discipline.

The Accreditation Council is required to meet at least once each year, but can meet as often as required to review and decide on all questions of accreditation.

1.3 Scope

LAAC is a specialized, non-governmental evaluating body that accredits educational programs leading to first-professional degrees at the Bachelor's or Master's level in Canada. Other programs, such as technical, pre-professional, and advanced professional programs, lie outside LAAC's scope.

In addition to assessing how well programs meet their own specific and institutional educational mission and objectives, accreditation evaluates programs against published standards to ensure that the essential educational components leading to entry-level professional competence are continuously achieved. The Landscape Architecture Accreditation Council formally reviews and assesses the Standards and Procedures every six years and seeks advice and input from landscape architecture educators and practitioners during the process. Minor changes can be reviewed annually and the document can be amended to reflect those changes at any time.

1.4 Values

To achieve its mission, the Landscape Architecture Accreditation Council seeks to:

- Uphold the standards it establishes in an ethical, non-discriminatory, and non-punitive manner.
- Promote transparency and clarity in its decisions and actions.
- Support diversity in all its varied forms.
- Encourage experimentation, innovation and flexibility in curriculum.
- Promote self-examination and self-analysis of programs and their curriculum by accredited programs.
- Aspire to achieve educational excellence as the foundation of professional practice.
- Encourage education that prepares students to succeed in a complex and dynamic global context.

1.5 Definitions and Interpretations

1. **Accreditation** – A non-governmental, voluntary process of peer review designed to evaluate programs based on their stated mission, objectives and learning outcomes and the accreditation standards that follow.
2. **Action Letter** – Official communication from LAAC to a Program reporting the accreditation decision and providing a summary of recommendations affecting accreditation of the program.
3. **Assessment** – Each criterion has one or more questions that seek qualitative and quantitative evidence that is used to assess the level of compliance with, or achievement of, the related criteria.
4. **Candidacy Status** – An academic unit that has enrolled in a working relationship with the Landscape Architecture Accreditation Council to ensure that it is properly positioned for a successful Initial Accreditation Review and approval.
5. **Compliance** – Achieved when the LAAC concludes, after review of relevant indicators or other evidence, that a standard is "met" or "met with recommendation" as defined below. To achieve accreditation a program must demonstrate to the LAAC, through the Self-Evaluation Report, site visit, and technical accuracy review of the visiting team report, that it complies with published standards.

6. **Continuing Accreditation Status** – An established academic unit that has already achieved Initial Accreditation and is working towards its second (or subsequent) accreditation renewal.
7. **Criteria** – Each standard has one or more criteria statements that define the components needed to satisfy the related standard. Not satisfying a criterion does not automatically lead to an assessment of a standard as "not met". To be accredited a program demonstrates progress towards meeting the criteria. In this document, criteria are identified by letters (e.g., A. Program Mission).
8. **New Program Status** – A program that has successfully completed its initial Accreditation review and has commenced its first review cycle.
9. **First-Professional Landscape Architecture Program** – A "first-professional program" in landscape architecture encompasses the body of knowledge common to the landscape architecture profession and promotes acquisition of knowledge and abilities necessary to enter the professional practice of landscape architecture:
 - a) At the **Bachelor's level** – in a context that is enriched by a broad foundation in the Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences,
 - b) At the **Master's level** – by providing instruction in and application of research and or/scholarly methods.
10. **Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTE)** – FTE is a figure representing the aggregated time committed by full- and part-time faculty members to teaching in a department or program, including faculty who have their duties or teaching assignments split between an undergraduate and a graduate program and faculty who have their assignments split between disciplines. For purposes of calculation, a faculty member with a part-time appointment of 50 percent (and, presumably, a teaching/scholarship/service assignment roughly equivalent to half that of a full-time faculty member) would be assigned to a 0.5 FTE. A full-time faculty member with duties in only one department would be assigned to an FTE of 1.0 for that department.
11. **Full-Time Faculty** – Members of the faculty engaged in a full course load of instruction as defined by the norms of the governing institution and accepted practice within the Canadian university context.
12. **Initial Accreditation** – The first accreditation for a program leading to a degree in landscape architecture. Initial Accreditation applies retroactively to degrees awarded by the program in the year in which the review takes place, as well as degrees granted in the immediately preceding year.
13. **Intent** – Explains the purpose of the standard.
14. **Learning Outcomes** – Learning Outcomes are statements that describe significant and essential knowledge, abilities (skills) and values that students are expected to achieve and reliably demonstrate at the end of a course or program.
15. **Part-Time Faculty** – Members of the faculty without a full course load of instruction, typically characterized as Adjunct, Affiliate, and/or Sessional Lecturers, but not including Teaching Assistants drawn from the student body.
16. **Program** – An inclusive term for the coursework and other learning experiences leading to a degree and the supporting administration, faculty, facilities, and student services that sponsor and provide those experiences.
17. **Program Administrator** – An individual holding a full academic appointment and exercising the leadership and management functions of the program. Note, this is an all-inclusive term used in this text to describe an administrative position that may be characterized in the particular institution as: Head, Director, Coordinator, Chairperson, or equivalent.
18. **Recommendations Affecting Accreditation** – are issues of serious concern, directly affecting the quality of the program. Recommendations Affecting Accreditation are only made when the visiting team assesses a standard as met with recommendation or not met. Recommendations are derived from the identified areas of weakness in meeting a standard that are described in the rationale sections of the visiting team report. The program is required to report progress regularly on these issues. Recommendations Affecting Accreditation identify issues and do not prescribe solutions.
19. **Self-Evaluation Report (SER)** – An SER is a document prepared by a program that describes its expectations, operations, and resources; assesses its progress toward meeting its mission, goals, and objectives; and measures its performance against the criteria for accreditation.
20. **Shall** – Wherever used in the Standards is defined as "mandatory".
21. **Should** – Wherever used in the Standards is defined as "prescriptive".

22. **Standards** – Qualitative and quantitative statements of the essential conditions that an accredited program must continuously meet. A program must demonstrate adequate evidence of compliance with all LAAC standards to achieve and maintain accreditation.
23. **Standard Met** – Is employed when evidence shows that overall program performance in this area meets LAAC minimum standards. Note, a standard may be judged as met even though one or more indicators are not minimally met.
24. **Standard Met with Recommendation** – Is employed when deficiencies exist in an area directly bearing on accreditation. The problem or problems are determined to have observable effects on the overall quality of the Program.
25. **Standard Not Met** – Indicates that the cited deficiency is so severe that the overall quality of the program is compromised and the program's ability to deliver adequate landscape architecture education is impaired.
26. **Suggestions for Improvement** – Areas where the program can build on a strength or address an area of concern that does not directly affect accreditation at the time of the LAAC review.

1.6 Related Accreditation Documentation

The CSLA Manual of Accreditation Standards and Procedures must be read together with the following companion documents, which are all available in hard copy from the CSLA, or by download from the CSLA website:

- ASLA - CSLA Reciprocity Agreement
- Guidelines for preparation of a Digital/Electronic Compendium of Student Work (see Appendix B)
- Visiting Team Guidelines
- Visiting Team Report Template
- Visiting Team Conflict of Interest Form

The LAAC reserves the right to vary from these published documents and procedures if such an action is in the best interest of a Program.

2.0 STANDARDS

2.1 Standard One – Program Mission, Goals and Objectives

The program shall have a clearly defined mission supported by goals and objectives that are appropriate to the profession of landscape architecture and shall demonstrate progress towards their attainment.

INTENT: Using a clear and concise mission statement, each landscape architecture program should define its core values and fundamental purpose for faculty, students, prospective students, and the institution. The mission statement summarizes the intent, the objectives, and the needs that the program seeks to fulfill and also provides a benchmark for assessing how well the program is meeting the stated objectives.

A. Program Mission. The mission statement expresses the underlying purposes and values of the program.

Assessment: Does the program have a clearly stated mission reflecting the purpose and values of the program and does it relate to the institution's mission statement?¹

B. Educational Goals. The program shall have clearly defined and formally stated academic goals that reflect the mission and demonstrate that attainment of the goals will fulfill the program mission.

Assessment: Does the program have clearly defined and achievable educational objectives that describe how the goals will be met?

C. Educational Objectives. The program shall have educational objectives that specifically describe how each of the academic goals will be achieved.

Assessment: Does the program have clearly defined and achievable educational objectives and an effective, regularly used procedure to determine progress in meeting them?

D. Strategic Planning Process. The program is engaged in a strategic planning process that reflects short, and long-term planning.

Assessment 1: Does the strategic plan describe how the program mission, goals and objectives will be met over the various planning horizons and document the review and evaluation process?

Assessment 2: Is the strategic plan reviewed and revised periodically and does it present realistic and attainable methods for advancing the academic mission?

Assessment 3: Does the Self-Evaluation Report (SER) respond to the previous accreditation recommendations (if applicable) and does it report on efforts to rectify identified weaknesses?

E. Program Disclosure. Program literature and promotional media accurately describe the program's mission, goals and objectives, educational experiences and accreditation status.

Assessment 1: Is the program information accurate and easily accessed via the Institution's website?

Assessment 2: Does the program literature and promotional literature accurately describe program's mission, goals, objectives and accreditation status?

¹ It is recognized that Mission Statements will often vary between programs, reflecting specific regional factors and/or the particular academic focus of the parent institution

2.2 Standard Two – Program Autonomy, Governance & Administration

The program shall have the authority and resources to achieve its mission, goals and objectives.

INTENT: Landscape architecture should be recognized as a discrete professional program with sufficient financial and institutional support and authority to enable achievement of the stated program mission, goals and objectives.

A. Program Administration. Landscape architecture is administered as an identifiable/discrete program and is so noted in the program title and degree(s) offered.

Assessment 1: Is the program a discrete and identifiable program within the institution?

Assessment 2: Does the program title and degree description incorporate the term "Landscape Architecture"?

Assessment 3: Does the Program Administrator hold a full academic appointment in landscape architecture?

Assessment 4: Does the Program Administrator exercise the leadership and management functions of the program?

B. Institutional Support. The institution provides sufficient resources to enable the program to achieve its mission and goals and to support individual faculty development and advancement.

Assessment 1: Are student/faculty ratios in studios typically not greater than 15:1?

Assessment 2: Is funding available to assist faculty and other instructional personnel with continued professional development including support in developing funded grants, attendance at conferences and provision of computers and appropriate software, other types of equipment, and technical support?

Assessment 4: Is funding adequate² for student support, i.e., scholarships, work-study, etc.?

Assessment 5: Are adequate³ support personnel available to accomplish program mission and goals?

C. Commitment to Inclusiveness and Diversity. The program demonstrates commitment to inclusiveness and diversity through its recruitment and retention of faculty, staff, and students.

Assessment 1: Does the program demonstrate a commitment to diversity in the recruitment and retention of students, faculty and staff?

Assessment 2: Does the program demonstrate this commitment to diversity throughout its student's full academic progress?

2.3 Standard Three – Professional Curriculum

The first-professional degree curriculum shall include the core knowledge, skills, and applications of landscape architecture.

- a. In addition to the professional curriculum, a first-professional degree program at the Bachelor's level shall provide an educational context enriched by other disciplines, including but not limited to: Humanities, Social Sciences and Natural Sciences, as well as opportunities for students to develop other areas of interest.*
- b. In addition to the professional curriculum, a first-professional degree at the Master's level shall provide instruction in and application of research and or/scholarly methods.*

INTENT: The purpose of the curriculum is to achieve the learning goals stated in the mission and stated learning outcomes. Curriculum objectives should relate to the program's mission and specific learning outcomes. The program's

² It is acknowledged that the "adequacy" of funding is difficult to objectively evaluate. It is expected that the Visiting Team's interview process with faculty and students will expose deficiencies, as will the Self Evaluation Report's review of these funding levels compared to other disciplines and programs within the institution.

³ It is acknowledged that the "adequacy" of support personnel is difficult to objectively evaluate. It is expected that the Self Evaluation Report, and faculty interviews, will reveal shortcomings in support that unreasonably divert faculty from their principal roles in course preparation, instruction and research. The program may also clarify this question in the Self Evaluation Report by providing comparisons with other disciplines and programs within the institution.

curriculum should encompass coursework and other opportunities intended to develop students' knowledge and abilities in landscape architecture.

A. Mission and Learning Outcomes. The program's curriculum addresses its mission, goals, and objectives.

Assessment: Does the program identify the knowledge, abilities and values it expects students to possess at graduation?

B. Professional Curriculum.

The program curriculum should be guided by, but not limited to coverage of:

History, theory, philosophy, principles, and values

design history, including: landscape architecture, urban design and garden design in a global and a Canadian context

design theory and criticism

environmental ethics and aesthetics (in a landscape architectural context)

Design processes and methodology

critical thinking

analysis

ideation

data acquisition, management and interpretation

synthesis

site programming

iterative design development

design communication

landscape design, planning and management at various scales and applications (e.g. planting design, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, grading and drainage)

Natural and cultural systems and processes (related to design, planning and management)

ecosystems sciences including soils and hydrology, and plants

built environment, urban systems and infrastructure

social and cultural influences on landscape

urban-rural relationships and linkages

storm water management, ecosystem protection, resource management, natural system restoration and rehabilitation

human health and well being

Communication and documentation

written and oral communication

visual and graphic communication

design and construction documents

numeracy and quantitative problem-solving, and communication

public and client engagement

Computer applications and advanced technologies

computer-aided design

3D modeling and visualization

publishing, word processing and spreadsheets

geospatial analysis

Assessment and evaluation

site assessment

- visual and scenic assessment
- landscape performance
- post-occupancy evaluation

Operational context of landscape architecture

- land use planning
- regional planning
- public policy and regulation
- sustainability, resiliency, low-impact design, stewardship
- health, safety, human welfare
- professional certification and licensing
- building codes and accessibility legislation
- principles of contract law

Project Implementation

- basic principles of surveying and layout
- Site materials
- use and management of plants and vegetation
- construction technologies, site engineering and applications
- construction related policies and regulation

Professional practice

- values
- ethics in professional practice
- business planning
- marketing and social networking
- specification writing and contract preparation
- scheduling
- cost estimating
- forms of contract delivery
- construction administration

Research and scholarly methods (for master of landscape architecture programs)

- quantitative and qualitative methods
- establishing a research hypothesis
- framing research questions
- review of literature, case studies and precedents
- research integrity and protection of human subjects
- communication of research

Assessment 1: Does the curriculum provide a balanced coverage of the designated subject matters and introduce the subject matter in a sequence that supports its goals and intended learning outcomes?

Assessment 2: Does student work and other accomplishments demonstrate that the curriculum is providing students with the appropriate content to assume an entry-level position in the profession?

Assessment 3: Do curriculum and program opportunities enable students to pursue personal academic interests consistent with institutional requirements and entry into the profession?

C. Syllabi. Syllabi are maintained for courses.

Assessment 1: Are syllabi readily accessible and do they include the intended learning outcomes, course content, and the criteria and methods that will be used to evaluate student performance?

Assessment 2: Do syllabi and related assignments identify the various levels of accomplishment students shall achieve to complete the course successfully and advance in the curriculum?

D. Curriculum Evaluation. At the course and curriculum levels, the program evaluates how effectively the curriculum is helping students achieve the program's learning outcomes in a timely way.

Assessment 1: Does the program demonstrate and document ways of:

- a. Assessing students' achievement of the intended learning outcomes of the course and program?
- b. Reviewing and improving the effectiveness of instructional methods in curriculum delivery?
- c. Maintaining currency with evolving technologies, methodologies, theories and directions of the profession?

Assessment 2: Do students participate in evaluation of the program, courses and curriculum?

E. Augmentation of Formal Educational Experience. The program provides opportunities for students to participate in internships and exchange programs, off-campus studies, public service, research assistantships, or practicum experiences.

Assessment 1: Does the program provide any of these opportunities?

Assessment 2: How does the program identify the learning outcomes and evaluate the effectiveness of these opportunities?

Assessment 3: Do students report on these experiences to their peers? If so, how?

F. Coursework (Bachelor's Level). In addition to the professional curriculum, students also pursue coursework in other disciplines and acquire an introduction to investigative and scholarly methods in accordance with institutional and program requirements.

Assessment 1: Do students take a broad range of courses in the Humanities, Natural and Social Sciences?

Assessment 2: Do students receive an introduction to Investigative and Scholarly Methods appropriate to an undergraduate education?

G. Areas of Interest (Bachelor's Level). The program provides opportunities for students to pursue special interests.

Assessment 1: Does the program provide opportunities for students to pursue independent projects, focused electives, optional studios, certificates, minors, etc.?

Assessment 2: Does student work incorporate academic experiences reflecting a variety of pursuits beyond the basic curriculum?

Assessment 3: Does the curriculum provide an introduction to investigative and scholarly methods?

G. Research and Scholarly Methods (Master's Level). The program provides advanced education in Investigative and Scholarly methods.

Assessment 1: Does the curriculum provide instruction in Research and Scholarly Methods and their relation to the profession of landscape architecture?

Assessment 2: Does the program demonstrate that theses or terminal projects exhibit creative and independent thinking and contain a significant research/scholarly component?

2.4 Standard Four – Student and Program Outcomes.

The program shall prepare students to pursue careers in landscape architecture.

INTENT: Students should be prepared – through educational programs, advising, and other academic and professional opportunities – to pursue a career in landscape architecture upon graduation. Students should have demonstrated knowledge and abilities in creative problem-solving, critical thinking, communications, and design implementation to allow them to enter the profession of landscape architecture.

A. Learning Outcomes. Upon completion of the program, students are qualified to pursue a career in landscape architecture.

Assessment 1: Does student work demonstrate the competency required for entry-level positions in the profession of landscape architecture?

Assessment 2: Do students demonstrate their achievement of the program's intended learning outcomes?

Assessment 3: Are alumni satisfied with the academic experience and preparation for professional practice?

B. Student Advising. The program provides students with effective advising and mentoring throughout their education.

Assessment 1: Are students effectively advised and mentored regarding academic development?

Assessment 2: Are students made aware of professional opportunities, licensure, professional development, advanced educational opportunities and continuing education requirements associated with professional practice?

Assessment 4: Are students satisfied with the academic experiences and their preparation for the landscape architecture profession?

C. Participation in Extra Curricular Activities. Students are encouraged and have the opportunity to participate in professional activities and institutional and community service.

Assessment 1: Does the institution provide opportunities for students to participate in institutional organizations, community initiatives, or other activities?

Assessment 2: Does the program provide opportunities for students to participate in events where they are exposed to the profession, such as: CSLA Annual Meetings; Component Association meetings and events; other associated professional societies or special interest groups; Construction Industry-related organizations; public lectures?

2.5 Standard Five – Faculty

The qualifications, academic position, and professional practice activities of faculty and instructional personnel shall promote and enhance the academic mission and intended learning outcomes of the program.

INTENT: The program should have qualified experienced faculty and other instructional personnel to provide the knowledge and abilities that students will need to pursue a career in landscape architecture. Faculty workloads, compensation, and overall support received for career development contribute to the success of the program.

A. Credentials. The academic qualifications, professional experience and teaching skills of the faculty, instructional personnel, and teaching assistants are appropriate to their roles and the courses in which they provide instruction.

Assessment 1: Are qualifications appropriate to responsibilities of the program as defined by the institution?

Assessment 2: Are faculty assignments appropriate to the course content and program mission?

Assessment 3: Are faculty actively engaged in scholarly pursuits and/or professional activities and external service activities?

Assessment 4: Do faculty members have a variety of areas of academic focus so that a range of viewpoints is maintained?

Assessment 5: Is there a balanced mix of professors at different stages of career development?

Assessment 6: Does the faculty have a balance of professional practice and academic experience appropriate to the program mission?

B. Faculty Participation and Recognition. The faculty participates in program governance and administration.

Assessment 1: Do faculty members have voting privileges, academic freedom, and tenure opportunities consistent with the principles of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC)?

Assessment 2: Does the faculty have the ability and responsibility to develop, implement, evaluate, and modify the program's curriculum and operating practices?

Assessment 3: Does the faculty make recommendations on the allocation of financial resources for capital improvements and up-grades?

Assessment 4: Does the program or institution adequately communicate and mentor faculty regarding policies, expectations and procedures for annual evaluations, and for tenure and promotion to all ranks?

Assessment 5: Are faculty salary levels commensurate with those of other similar departments in the institution?

C. Faculty Number. The faculty shall be of a sufficient size to accomplish the program's goals and objectives, to teach the curriculum, to support students through advising and other functions, to engage in research, creative activity and scholarship, and be actively involved in professional endeavours such as presenting at conferences. To address this criterion:

1. An academic unit that offers a single first-professional degree program at the Continuing Full Accreditation Status shall have an FTE of at least five instructional faculty. At least four of the five shall hold a professional degree in landscape architecture. At least three of the five shall be Full-time.
2. An academic unit that offers first-professional degree programs at both the bachelor's and master's levels at the Continuing Full Accreditation Status shall have an FTE of at least seven instructional faculty. At least five of the seven shall hold professional degrees in landscape architecture. At least five of the seven shall be Full-time.
3. The majority of the faculty members should be members of the Canadian Society of Landscape Architects or equivalent professional institution.
4. The Self-Evaluation Report shall include a discussion of the University's requirements for faculty and teaching staff numbers and composition.

Assessment 1: Is the minimum number of faculty, their academic qualifications, and employment status (i.e. Full-time vs. Part-time) in accordance with the above-noted requirements?

Assessment 2: Beyond achieving the specified minimums, is the faculty number adequately matched to student enrollment and is it of sufficient size to achieve the program's overall mission and goals and also promote individual faculty development?

Assessment 3: Are the majority of the faculty members of the CSLA, or equivalent professional institution?

Assessment 4: Does the strategic plan or long-range plan include action item(s) for addressing the adequacy of the number and qualifications of faculty?

D. Faculty Development. The faculty is continuously engaged in activities leading to their professional growth and advancement, the advancement of the profession, and the effectiveness of the program.

Assessment 1: Are faculty activities such as scholarly inquiry, research, professional practice, and service to the profession, university and community documented and disseminated through appropriate media such as journals, professional magazines, community, college and university media?

Assessment 2: Do faculty teaching and administrative assignments allow sufficient opportunity to pursue advancement and professional development?

Assessment 3: Are the development and teaching effectiveness of faculty and instructional personnel systematically evaluated by peers and students and are the results used for individual and program improvement?

Assessment 4: Do faculty seek and make effective use of available funding for conference attendance, equipment and technical support, etc.?

Assessment 5: Are the activities of faculty recognized by faculty peers?

Assessment 6: Do faculty members participate in university and professional service, student advising and other activities that enhance the effectiveness of the program?

E. Faculty Retention. Faculty members hold academic status, have workloads, and receive salaries, mentoring and support that promote productivity and retention.

Assessment 1: Do faculty salaries, academic and professional recognition promote faculty retention and productivity?

Assessment 2: The rate of faculty turnover does not undermine the mission and goals of the program.

2.6 Standard Six – Community Outreach and Public Service

The program shall have a plan for and a record of interaction with its alumni, the larger institution, the professional community, the local community, and the public at large.

INTENT: Each landscape architecture program shall establish an effective relationship with the larger institution, its alumni, practitioners, the local community and the public at large in order to provide a source of service-learning opportunities for students, scholarly development for faculty, and professional guidance and financial support.

Documentation and dissemination of successful outreach efforts shall enhance the image of the program and educate its constituencies regarding the program and the profession of landscape architecture.

A. Interaction with the Profession, Institution and Public. The program shall represent and advocate for the profession by interacting with the larger institution, the local community, practitioners, the professional associations and the public at large.

Assessment 1: Are service-learning activities incorporated into the curriculum?

Assessment 2: Are service activities documented on a regular basis?

Assessment 3: Does the program interact with the institution, practitioners, the community and the public at large?

B. Outreach to Alumni and Practitioners. The program recognizes alumni and practitioners as a resource.

Assessment 1: Does the program maintain or have access to a registry of alumni that includes information pertaining to current employment, professional activity, postgraduate study, and significant professional accomplishments?

Assessment 2: Does the program engage the alumni and practitioners in activities such as a formal advisory board, career advising, potential employment, curriculum review and development, fund raising, continuing education, design-review panels, design charrettes, student awards, etc.?

Assessment 3: Does the program document, acknowledge and celebrate the significant professional accomplishments of its alumni and benefactors?

2.7 Standard Seven – Facilities, Equipment, Libraries and Technology

Faculty, students and staff shall have access to facilities, equipment, library resources, technologies and other supports necessary for achieving the program's mission and intended learning outcomes.

INTENT: The program should occupy space in designated, accessible facilities that support the achievement of program mission and intended learning outcomes. Students, faculty, and staff should have the required tools and facilities to enable achievement of the program mission and intended learning outcomes.

A. Facilities. There are designated, universally accessible and adequately maintained spaces that serve the professional requirements of the faculty, students and staff.

Assessment 1: Are faculty, staff and administration provided with appropriate office space?

Assessment 2: Do students have sufficient space and facilities to perform their work and are the hours of operation supportive of their educational needs?

Assessment 3: Are program facilities designed in a way that promotes and supports cooperative learning, design inquiry and creative expression?

B. Technologies and Related Equipment. The technological resources needed to achieve the program's mission and intended learning outcomes are available to students, faculty and other instructional and administrative personnel.

Assessment 1: Does the program have sufficient digital resources (e.g. computer workstations, internet access, software, printing/plotting, and model-making)?

Assessment 2: Do students have adequate access to technical support staff and instruction?

Assessment 3: Does the program have a procedure to manage and remain current with evolving technology?

Assessment 4: Are the hours of use sufficient to serve faculty and students?

C. Library Resources. Library collections, resources and services are sufficient to support the program's mission and intended learning outcomes.

Assessment 1: Are collections adequate to support the program?

Assessment 2: Do courses integrate library and other resources?

Assessment 3: Are the library hours of operation convenient and adequate to serve the needs of faculty and students?

3.0 Accreditation Procedures and Process

3.1 Applying for Accreditation

Process – Applications for both Initial Accreditation and on-going Accreditation Renewal must be received by the LAAC at least four months prior to the anticipated review visit. In all cases, applications must be in the form of a letter from the Dean of the Faculty or College in which the Landscape Architecture program is housed.

Fees – Initial Accreditation visits are subject to a specific visit fee that is set at a level designed to cover the LAAC review expenses and related costs. In the case of routine renewal of accreditation for established programs, the visit costs are covered in the accumulated annual fees charged to the program and a specific visit fee is not required. For all relevant LAAC fees, refer to the Schedule of Fees available on-line at the CSLA website.

Compliance Rules:

- a) Established programs that have achieved Continuing Accreditation Status and are applying for routine accreditation renewal must demonstrate compliance with all seven published Accreditation Standards.
- b) In the case of New Programs, however, in recognition of their developing/emerging status, programs applying for their Initial Accreditation are granted partial relief from the rules regarding the number of Faculty. In all other respects, however, New Programs must demonstrate compliance with the published Standards. These modified rules are more fully described below.

3.2 Modified Faculty Requirements for New Programs

A New Program that offers a first-professional degree program at the bachelor's level shall have at least three FTE instructional faculty who hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, at least one of whom shall be full-time. The majority of the faculty members shall also be members of the Canadian Society of Landscape Architects.

A New Program that offers a first-professional degree program at both the bachelor's and master's levels shall have at least six FTE instructional faculty, five of whom hold professional degrees in landscape architecture, at least two of whom shall be full-time. The majority of the faculty members shall also be members of the Canadian Society of Landscape Architects.

Before formally applying for an Initial Accreditation review, however, a New Program must in all other respects be in full compliance with all seven LAAC Standards and also have granted degrees to at least one graduating class.

Once granted Initial Accreditation, a New Program must progressively increase its faculty numbers to meet the full LAAC Faculty Standard no later than three years from the date of approval.

3.3 Candidacy Status

The LAAC has developed an optional "Candidacy Status" to help non-accredited programs prepare for the accreditation process. Candidacy Status is a classification granted to any program in the planning or developmental stages of implementation. This classification provides evidence to the educational institution, professional associations, students, and the public that the program under development appears to have the potential to ultimately meet the LAAC accreditation standards. Once granted Candidacy Status, the CSLA will acknowledge the program's status on their website.

The purpose of Candidacy Status is to establish an on-going constructive partnership between LAAC and the institution working towards accreditation. Programs designated with "Candidacy Status" have voluntarily committed to work toward LAAC accreditation. While Candidacy Status signifies that the program is demonstrating reasonable progress towards accreditation, it does not indicate that the program is presently accredited, nor that it is ultimately guaranteed to achieve full accreditation.

To achieve Candidacy Status, a program must submit a Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and undergo a preliminary program review. The SER must fully explain the program's strategic plan to achieve full compliance with the Standards and the present state of its progress toward that goal. The program is also encouraged to explain in the SER any regional or local aspects of the program that differentiate the school, course, and program from those already being offered in Canada. The preliminary program review also requires a mini-accreditation visit during which two members of the LAAC, and/or the Roster of Visiting Evaluators, examine the program's SER and conduct a 1-2 day visit to the program.

The LAAC will vote on whether to grant a program Candidacy Status at its next regularly scheduled meeting after reviewing the program's SER and the report from the mini-review team. If the LAAC decides not to grant Candidacy Status, the decision is not subject to appeal. The program will be informed in writing of the LAAC's decision.

After achieving Candidacy Status, programs are required to submit annual progress reports to LAAC. These reports will be reviewed and LAAC will make recommendations and suggestions on how the program can continue to advance towards meeting the accreditation standards.

After achieving Candidacy Status, a program must formally apply for Initial Accreditation within one year of graduating its first class. If initial Accreditation is not granted at that time, the program can retain its Candidacy Status for one additional year.

Candidacy Status programs are responsible for all expenses of the initial mini-review, as well as an annual sustaining fee, as set out in the Schedule of LAAC Fees available from the CSLA website.

3.4 Self-Evaluation Report

All programs applying for accreditation prepare a Self-Evaluation Report (SER) following the required LAAC format. The SER describes the program's mission and intended learning outcomes, its self-assessment, and future plans; provides a detailed response to the recommendations of the previous visiting team; and details the program's compliance with each accreditation standard. It is important that faculty, administrators, and students all participate in preparing the self-evaluation report. The SER must include a statement explaining the participation of each group.

The SER must include a condensed resume (maximum two pages) for each faculty member currently teaching in the program. The resume must list:

the courses currently taught;

- educational background;
- recent honors and awards;
- recent research, scholarship, and creative activity;
- recent publications;
- current academic, professional, and public service; and
- professional memberships.

The term "recent" refers to accomplishments and changes since the last accreditation visit.

3.5 Pre-Visit Sequence of Events and Time Line

The following summarizes the timeline and critical sequence of events prior to the team visit:

- Prior to the intended review, the program arranges to have the Dean issue a formal visit request in writing. This request must be submitted at least 120 days prior to the desired visit and must identify the preferred visit dates. LAAC will work with the program to ensure that the proposed visit timing does not overlap or otherwise conflict with the timing of reviews by other Accrediting and Professional Agencies.

- At least 60 days prior to the agreed visit, the program shall submit a draft copy of the SER to the LAAC Chair for a preliminary review. The primary purpose of this preliminary review is not to assess the quality of the program, but rather to determine the completeness and clarity of the SER.
- Within 15 days of receipt of the draft SER, the Chair shall advise the program of any required revisions or additions.
- The program shall have a further 15 days to make any necessary revisions and issue the final SER, which shall include two hard-copies to the Chair of LAAC and one hard-copy, together with the proposed visit schedule, to each member of the visiting team.
- Regardless of the above-noted deadlines, the final approved SER shall be available to the Visiting Team at least 30 days prior to the visit.
- Copies of all submitted documentation shall also be made available in a digital format. The program is responsible for all related printing and distribution costs for the SER.
- If the documents are not submitted by the required deadline, the program may be notified that the visit has been postponed. In the case of a currently accredited program, this may result in the suspension of accreditation and/or the term of accreditation expiring.

3.6 Roster of Visiting Evaluators

The LAAC maintains the Roster of Visiting Evaluators (ROVE). Visiting Team members are typically selected from this Roster, but may, at the discretion of the LAAC, also be recruited from the ASLA LAAB Roster or other suitable candidates.

There are three categories of evaluators:

Landscape Architecture Educators who hold a first-professional degree in landscape architecture, teach in an accredited program, and hold the minimum academic rank of tenured associate professor. Academic team members undertaking a review of a master's level program should typically possess a minimum of an MLA degree.

Academic Administrators (current or former) who hold the minimum rank of assistant or associate dean, including non-landscape architects, and who hold a terminal degree in their respective fields. While preference in this category will be for candidates drawn from a related design or planning discipline, this is not considered mandatory.

Landscape Architecture Practitioners who have a first-professional degree in landscape architecture and at least 10 years of practice experience. Practitioner team members undertaking a review of a master's level program should typically possess a minimum of an MLA degree.

Exceptions to these criteria can be made at the discretion of the LAAC chair.

To ensure wide representation of the educational community, accredited programs are invited to nominate one Landscape Architecture Educator and one Academic Administrator to the ROVE. Similarly, each CSLA component chapter is encouraged to nominate a minimum of two practitioners to the ROVE. The LAAC will evaluate the qualifications of ROVE nominees and will provide orientation and training for those chosen to attend an evaluation visit. Appointments are for 5 years and are renewable at the discretion of the LAAC. Information required of all ROVE candidates and members shall include current location, school affiliations, and previous visits, as well as a resume. On request, the LAAC will make the current ROVE database available to the programs.

3.7 Visiting Team Selection

The Visiting Team consists of one landscape architecture educator, one practitioner, and one academic administrator. The LAAC Chair selects a proposed visiting team and designates one member as Team Chair, who will typically be an

experienced educator, or an experienced practitioner who has knowledge of University contexts. The majority of the visiting team should be fluent in the language of the Program being reviewed.

Teams are selected to avoid potential conflicts of interest and must execute the standard LAAC Conflict of Interest Declaration (see Appendix C), which stipulates that Visiting Team Members must not have:

- Attended as a student or graduated from the program (within the preceding six years).
- Been employed by the program as a professor, associate professor, adjunct professor, visiting professor, sessional lecturer or similar position (within the preceding five years).
- Is seeking, or currently being considered for, employment with the program.
- Served on an advisory, governing, research or evaluation body associated with the program (within the preceding five years).
- Been a collaborator or editor on a consulting project, book, journal article, report, paper or similar learned undertaking with any of the existing faculty of the program (within the preceding five years).
- Formed a pre-determined opinion regarding the quality and/or reputation of the program, or any of its faculty, that might adversely affect the objectivity of the review.
- A family relationship with faculty, administrators, or current students of the program.
- A close personal or professional relationships with faculty in the program.
- Monetary or other personal interests in the outcome of the accreditation decision.

The program is advised of the proposed team; including each proposed team members present position, experience, and areas of expertise. The program has the right to challenge one team member, but must show reasonable cause, which typically requires documentation that the nominee is not competent to evaluate the program, or has an undisclosed or irresolvable conflict of interest. However, the final decision on team assignments rests with the LAAC Chair.

Following the program's review and approval of the potential visiting team members, the selected participants are invited to serve. When the Visiting Team composition and date of the review have been finalized, the team and the program are formally notified. Any subsequent changes in team make-up arising due to scheduling conflicts or emergencies are made in consultation with the program.

Where special conditions warrant, such as providing team member training or assisting with site-evaluation procedures and matters of due process, a four-person team may be assembled. At the discretion of the LAAC chair, one of the following additional individuals may be selected to accompany the standard three-person team: a LAAC member; a landscape architecture educator, or a professional practitioner, who has a specialist background relevant to the particular program under review; an educator from a related design profession, or a ROVE member assigned for training purposes.

3.8 Pre-Visit Responsibilities: Visiting Team

The team chair is responsible for making assignments and assembling the Visiting Team report. Team members receive the Accreditation Standards and Procedures Manual and the LAAC Visiting Team Guidelines and are expected to be thoroughly familiar with these documents before the accreditation visit. Each Visiting Team member must carefully review the Self-Evaluation Report and carry out assignments as the team chair directs.

3.9 Pre-Visit Responsibilities: Program

The LAAC Chair, after conferring with the team and the institution, schedules the dates of the accreditation visit. The program is responsible for arranging:

- All lodging for the visiting team. Hotel accommodations must be comfortable, reasonably priced, close to the institution, and, where possible, should make use of existing campus facilities such as those for visiting faculty or guest lecturers. Note that the LAAC is responsible for the cost of the travel, lodging, and meal expenses of the visiting team.

- A Team Room in which the visiting team can work throughout the entire site visit. This room shall be private and secure from both students and faculty members.
- Temporary computer facilities, including: a digital projector, access to the Internet; an electronic compilation of the SER and representative student work; and all other supporting documentation.
- Arrangements for a brief meeting with a cross-section of representatives from the alumni, practitioners, and the local professional association.
- Advanced notice to the component organization.

3.10 Sample Visit Schedule

The following is a sample activity schedule for a visiting LAAC team. Based on past experience, this outline is considered reasonable to undertake all necessary tasks and provide adequate time for preparation of a draft report. It is important to note that this schedule assumes that the team members have all had adequate time prior to the visit to thoroughly review the SER and examine the Digital Compendium of Student Work. The LAAC recognizes that a greater length of time may be required for a particular visit due to special circumstances and will work with the chair of the Visiting Team to make any necessary scheduling and/or financial adjustments.

Day 1 (Saturday)

This day is set aside in the schedule for those Visiting Team members who may need to travel to the site from distant points in Canada or the United States and is intended to allow those individuals the opportunity to take advantage of reasonable flight times, get established at the pre-arranged hotel, adjust to any time zone changes, relax, and generally prepare for the next few days of intensive activity.

Day 2 (Sunday)

- 12:00 - 2:00 pm Any Visiting Team members who did not arrive on Saturday are expected to arrive and check in to the pre-arranged hotel by the early afternoon.
- 2:00 - 2:30 pm Members meet and get acquainted.
- 2:30 - 3:30 pm Team meets with the Program Administrator to finalize the detailed visit schedule and discuss the program in general.
- 3:30 - 5:30 pm Team tours the facility with the Program Administrator, is introduced to the Team Room, and establishes any required network access.
- 5:30 - 7:00 pm Break time and dinner.
- 7:00 pm Executive session at the hotel: team confirms visit assignments and plans how the team will conduct interviews and various meetings that will take place during the visit.

Day 3 (Monday)

- 8:00 - 9:00 am Team breakfast at hotel and travel to program
- 9:00 - 9:30 am If the program is a component of a multi-disciplinary academic unit, meet with the Program Administrator and the relevant Chair or Director of the Faculty/Department/School.
- 9:30 - 10:00 am Meet with the Dean of the College in which the program resides.
- 10:00 - 10:30 am Team members briefly tour the facility while classes and studios are in active session in order to gain an understanding of the character and personality of the program and the student body.
- 10:30 - 12:00 am The Visiting Team is given a detailed curriculum overview and learning outcomes by the Program Administrator and Department Heads.
- 12:00 - 1:30 pm Working lunch sessions with delegated student representatives from each academic year (maximum of two representatives/year). The purpose of this session is to interview students and evaluate their satisfaction with the educational process. To the extent possible, this should not be a collective student social encounter. Rather, it is recommended that representatives

from each academic year be separately interviewed over lunch by one Visiting Team member, with the results subsequently shared with the full team.

- 1:30 - 3:00 pm Faculty interviews: separate half-hour sessions with individual faculty members to discuss in confidence their impressions of the program, its strengths, weaknesses, faculty input, and faculty development. Group faculty interviews can be conducted if determined to be more acceptable to the faculty and the team.
- 3:00 - 3:15 pm Break
- 3:15 - 5:00 pm Resume faculty interviews.
- 5:00 - 6:00 pm Meeting with representative recent graduates of the program to evaluate their satisfaction with the educational process and the degree to which the program prepared them to perform entry-level functions.
- 6:00 - 7:30 pm Team dinner.
- 7:30 pm Team meets in executive session at hotel review findings and plan for the next day's activities.

Day 4 (Tuesday)

- 8:00 - 9:00 am Team breakfast at hotel and travel to program
- 9:00 - 12:00 pm Complete faculty interviews.
- 12:00 - 1:30 pm Working lunch with representatives from the local component association of the CSLA and selected local practitioners to assess level of involvement by the profession in the program, satisfaction with the curriculum, and the level of preparedness of graduates for entry-level positions in the profession.
- 1:30 - 3:00 pm Team completes remainder of faculty interviews as necessary and inspects library and other supporting facilities, e.g., computing center, special services, etc.
- 3:00 - 6:00 pm Visiting Team executive session: preparation of the report.
- 6:00 - 7:00 pm Dinner break.
- 7:00 pm Visiting Team executive session to finalize report in draft.

Day 5 (Wednesday)

- 8:00 - 9:00 am Team breakfast at hotel and travel to program
- 9:00 - 10:00 am Meeting with Program Administrator to review findings.
- 10:00 - 10:30 am In the case of multi-disciplinary academic units: meet with the relevant Chair or Director of the Faculty/Department/School to review findings.
- 10:30 - 11:00 am Meet with the Dean of the Faculty and the President of the university to review findings.
- 11:00 - 12:00 am Report team findings to landscape architecture faculty.
- 12:00 pm Team lunch, return to hotel, review final report responsibilities, check-out of hotel and depart campus.
- 1:30 - 3:00 pm Final presentation to staff and students

The program prepares the preliminary Visit Schedule, SER and Digital Compendium of Student Work well in advance of the visit and ensures that these documents are forwarded for to the Visiting Team members at least thirty days prior to the visit.

As the recommended Visit Schedule includes interviews with students, recent graduates, faculty, and administration officials, as well as alumni and local practitioners, the Program Administrator must ensure that these interview arrangements are formalized well in advance of the visit.

Team members typically conduct interviews in person, but may elect to conduct interviews by telephone with persons such as alumni, practitioners, or faculty on leave who are otherwise unable to meet on campus. No evening events should be scheduled as the Visiting Team needs this time to work on its report and prepare for the next day.

The team members meet in executive sessions in the evenings to prepare the report in draft form and to decide on an advisory recommendation to the LAAC on the program's proposed accredited status. The team discusses the content of

this draft report (in outline form only) with the Program Administrator, Director/Chair, Faculty, Dean, and President of the University, but does not disclose the advisory recommendation that it will subsequently make to the LAAC. The outline report should address the strengths and weaknesses of the program, recommendations affecting accreditation, and suggestions for program improvement. The final report should be prepared after the visit and submitted to the LAAC.

3.11 Visiting Team Report

Prior to the visit, the LAAC provides the Visiting Team with copies of the Accreditation Standards and Procedures and the Visiting Team Guidelines. The guidelines also include a format (template) for the Visiting Team Report that is designed to ensure complete responses are provided to all LAAC requirements and accreditation standards. The Team Chair assigns writing tasks to individual team members as necessary and is responsible for compiling the final report.

Preparation of the Initial Draft Visiting Team Report – Within 15 days following the visit, the Team Chair completes an initial compilation and edit of the Visiting Team Report, which is then sent as a draft to the other team members and the LAAC Chair for review. The principal reason for this review is to confirm the accuracy and completeness of the content, but may also address matters of grammar, spelling and style.

Finalization of Visiting Team Report – Within a further 15 days, the Visiting Team members direct any comments or concerns regarding the draft report to the LAAC Chair. Any substantive changes or additions recommended by the team members will be referred by the LAAC Chair to the Team Chair for revisions, which may result in a re-distribution of report to the team members for a second round of review and confirmation. Once all revisions are complete, the Team Chair submits the Final Visiting Team Report to the LAAC Chair in a form suitable for distribution to the program and LAAC Council.

Schedule Expectations for Distribution to the Program – Taking the above-noted timing considerations into account, under normal circumstances distribution of the Final Visiting Report by the LAAC Chair to the institution should typically occur within 30-45 days of the Accreditation Team Visit.

3.12 Institutional Response

Distribution of Final Visiting Team Report to Institution –The LAAC Chair distributes the final report to the Program Administrator, including copies to the: Head/Chair of the relevant Faculty, Department or School; Dean of the Faculty; and President/Vice-President/Provost of the University. This version of the Visiting Team Report is submitted without including the Visiting Team’s advisory accreditation recommendation.

Institutional Review and Response – Within 15 days of receipt of the final report, the program shall submit its institutional response to the LAAC Chair. This response shall deal exclusively with those Standards that were assessed by the Visiting Team as “Met with Recommendation” or “Not Met” and shall be limited to substantive comments and corrections of factual matters. The institutional response may also include any supplementary documentation that the program deems pertinent to the Visiting Team’s assessment and the ultimate LAAC decision.

3.13 Distribution to LAAC Council

The Visiting Team Report and advisory accreditation recommendation, as well as the program's institutional response, are then assembled by the LAAC Chair and distributed to individual Council members for their review prior to the decision meeting.

3.14 Withdrawing an Application for Accreditation

Any time before a decision action by the LAAC, an institution may withdraw its accreditation application without penalty by written notification to the LAAC Chair. The LAAC will not refund fees and the program will be assessed for expenses incurred by LAAC up to the point of withdrawal.

3.15 LAAC Decision Meeting

The LAAC decision meeting shall be scheduled to occur within 30 days of receipt of the program's institutional response and will typically be conducted as a teleconference. However, if circumstances require, the decision meeting may be convened as a face-to-face session.

LAAC's decision will be based upon a holistic view of the program, and, in addition to considering the Visiting Team's report and advisory recommendation, will also take into consideration the program's self-evaluation report, annual reports, and institutional response. Prior to the decision meeting, the LAAC may choose to consult with a member of the Visiting Team (usually the Chair) and/or the Program Administrator to clarify items in the team report or the institutional response.

Programs may request the opportunity to appear before the LAAC to discuss the pending accreditation decision, but are not permitted to be present during deliberations or voting. The LAAC may also elect to invite representation from the program and/or the Visiting Team Chair at the decision meeting.

Any LAAC decision to "Deny" or "Withdraw" accreditation will be substantiated with specific reasons, and Program Administrators will be notified of their right to appeal any such decision (see Appeal Process). A program which has not been granted accredited status, or a program from which accreditation has been withdrawn, may reapply for accreditation when its administrators believe the program meets current requirements.

3.16 LAAC Actions

Accreditation is granted for a period of one to six years. A program may apply for an accreditation review at any time before its term expires, but may not defer a visit to extend its term. The LAAC may vary these normal terms at its discretion. Reasons for such variance will be supplied to the program. The official action letter to the institution indicates the date on which accreditation will expire.

A list of accredited programs is published on the CSLA website on an annual basis, which includes: the accredited status of each program; the next scheduled accreditation review date; and a copy of the accreditation action letter and summary of recommendations. As this information is also posted on the ASLA website, the LAAC ensures that the Landscape Accreditation Board records and published information are up-to-date and consistent with the CSLA site.

The LAAC can take the following actions:

Accreditation

- Granted when all standards are met, or when one or more standards are met with recommendations, and continued overall program quality and conformance to standards are judged likely to be maintained.
- Accreditation will typically be granted for six years, but reduced periods may be established at the discretion of LAAC.
- A program granted Accreditation may be required to submit special progress reports at the discretion of LAAC.

Provisional Accreditation

- Granted when one or more standards are met with recommendation and the cited deficiencies are such that continued overall program quality or conformance to standards is uncertain.
- Provisional Accreditation may be granted up to three years.
- This status shall not be granted more than twice without an intervening period of full Accreditation.

- Provisional status is not subject to appeal.

Initial Accreditation of a New Program

- Granted on a first review when all standards (with the exception of Faculty numbers) are at least minimally met and the program's continued development and conformance to the accreditation standards are considered likely.
- Once granted Initial Accreditation, New Programs must progressively increase its faculty numbers to meet the full LAAC Faculty Standard no later than three years from the date of approval.
- Programs receiving Initial Accreditation must also submit a Special Progress Report after three years to report on the program's overall development and to confirm that the standard for the number of faculty has been achieved.
- Initial Accreditation is typically granted for six years, however; the Special Progress Report will be reviewed by LAAC to determine if an earlier accreditation review should be scheduled or if it should remain as originally granted.

Administrative Suspension of Accreditation

- This status results if a program fails to maintain good standing for administrative reasons.
- Suspension of Accreditation is not subject to appeal.

Accreditation Denial

- This status results when an accreditation visit review determines one or more standards are not met.
- This determination is subject to appeal.

Withdrawal of Accreditation

- This status results if a program fails to comply with accreditation standards.
- This determination is subject to appeal.

3.17 Notification of Accreditation Decisions and Actions

The LAAC notifies the program in writing of the accreditation decision in the form of an Action Letter. Copies of the Action Letter are addressed to: the Program Administrator; Head/Chair of the relevant Faculty, Department or School; Dean of the Faculty; President/Vice-President/Provost of the University; and the CSLA.

3.18 Confidentiality

Except for the Action Letter and Summary of Recommendations published on the CSLA website, the LAAC treats all material generated by the program and LAAC related to the accreditation review as confidential. While the Visiting Team Report and Self-Evaluation Report are considered to be the property of the institution, the LAAC encourages the widest dissemination of this materials within the institution.

The LAAC reserves the right to disclose the complete report should the institution incorrectly advise the public, applicants to the program, or existing students regarding the report contents that might, in the judgment the LAAC, present a biased or distorted view of the site-evaluation findings.

3.19 Reference to Accredited Status

A program's accreditation status must be clearly conveyed in all program and institutional literature, websites and other public media directed to student enrollment. In particular, if a program offers more than one course of study leading to the same degree, (e.g., first-professional and post-professional MLAs) program literature must identify which course(s) of study is (are) accredited.

3.20 Delaying a scheduled Accreditation Visit

From time to time a program may need to delay a scheduled accreditation visit because of unexpected circumstances. LAAC will grant a site visit delay for up to one year if the following conditions are met:

- The program received a six-year term of accreditation at its last review.
- The program is currently in compliance with all published Accreditation Standards.
- All required annual fees and reports have been submitted.

To request a delay, the LAAC must receive a letter from the Dean of the College, or higher-ranking administrator, and must include the reasons for the delay.

If a delay is granted, the program shall pay a visit delay fee as specified in the LAAC Schedule of Fees. If the request for delay is received after the Visiting Team selection process has begun and LAAC has incurred non-refundable expenses (e.g. airfares, hotel deposits, etc.) the program shall pay the delay fee, plus all related visit expenses that have been incurred by the LAAC.

If an institution is scheduled to have two programs reviewed at the same time, only one delay fee is charged (both must meet above conditions). Regular annual fees still apply.

3.21 Rescheduling Visit

When the visit is rescheduled, priority for selecting visit dates will go to those programs hosting their visits in accordance with their regular cycle.

A delayed visit cannot be postponed a second time for any reason. If the rescheduled review does not take place, the program's accreditation will lapse. If a program subsequently chooses to re-apply for accreditation, it will be subject to the full Initial Accreditation process.

3.22 Term of Accreditation

When LAAC grants a full or provisional accreditation as a result of a regular accreditation review, the start of the new term shall be considered to extend from the date of the accreditation visit and shall be so noted in the Action Letter.

If LAAC issues a Suspension or Withdrawal of Accreditation, the program's accreditation immediately expires and all program literature and websites must be revised immediately to remove all references to accreditation.

3.23 Annual Report

Each accredited program shall submit an Annual Report to allow LAAC to monitor the program's continuing compliance with accreditation requirements. The report shall be prepared on an academic year basis and must be received by LAAC by July 31st of each year. Annual Reports are not typically required in a year in which a Self-Evaluation Report has been issued and a regularly scheduled accreditation visit has taken place.

Annual Reports shall include:

- a. Changes in curriculum, personnel, administration, fiscal support, and/or physical facilities that have occurred since the last report.
- b. Summary of the enrollment and graduation statistics, presented in a tabular form reflecting all years since the last review.
- c. Report on employment, or enrollment in graduate school, for the previous year's graduates.
- d. Progress toward complying with the recommendations of the most recent accreditation review.

The LAAC will review the Annual Report and acknowledge acceptance by the start of the next academic year. If there are significant concerns with the changes identified in the report, the LAAC will communicate these to the Program Administrator and may also alert, at its discretion, higher-level administrative officials.

3.24 Substantive Change

Substantive Change is any change that compromises a program's ability to meet continuously one or more of the accreditation standards approved and published by LAAC.

Responsibility for reporting and fully disclosing the impact of a pending Substantive Change rests with the Program Administrator, who is encouraged to notify the LAAC as soon as the change is contemplated. Regardless, all Substantive Changes must be fully disclosed in the next scheduled Annual Report.

LAAC will provide a response to the proposed Substantive Change within 30 days. To remain in good standing, the program must respond to the LAAC commentary and conditions within a further 30 days. The response must be in writing from the Program Administrator or a higher-level administrative official of the institution.

3.25 Other Reports

From time to time, the LAAC may require programs to prepare Special Reports to explain or describe a particular issue or problem. These issues will be ones that the LAAC believes are of a nature that requires additional explanation beyond that typically included in an Annual Report, or because the concerns are of a sufficiently urgent nature that they must be addressed before the next scheduled reporting period.

3.26 Maintaining Good Standing

To maintain good standing a program must continuously meet the published Accreditation Standards. The LAAC must be informed if any of these requirements cannot be met during an accreditation period. Should a program fail to maintain good standing, accreditation may be suspended or withdrawn.

3.27 Administrative Suspension of Accreditation

Should a program fail to maintain good standing for administrative reasons (such as failure to pay required fees or submit required reports) accreditation may be suspended. Before this action is taken the LAAC shall send a letter to the Program Administrator and the appropriate higher-level administrative officials of the institution requesting an explanation of why accreditation should not be suspended.

A program whose term of accreditation has been suspended will be listed as such on the official list of accredited programs included in the LAAC Annual Report to the CSLA and will also be removed from the list of accredited programs on the CSLA website. Students attending a program with suspended accreditation are still considered to be attending an accredited program. A program can be suspended for a maximum of one year. When the maximum period of suspension is reached, the LAAC will begin procedures to withdraw accreditation to take effect immediately.

If evidence of remedial action is submitted and judged adequate within the one-year period of suspension, reinstatement of the previous grant of accreditation may be made.

As suspension occurs in this situation only for administrative reasons, it is not subject to appeal.

3.28 Withdrawal of Accreditation

Should annual reports or other information indicate that the accreditation standards are no longer being met, LAAC may withdraw the accreditation of a program at any time during the six-year accreditation term.

The procedure for Withdrawal of Accreditation is as follows:

- a. The LAAC provides written notice to the Program Administrator and the appropriate higher-level administrative officials of the institution that it has reason to believe that the accreditation standards are no longer being met.
- b. As soon as possible, at a time agreed by LAAC and the program, a Visiting Team shall be selected to carry out a full accreditation review of the program.
- c. The Visiting Team shall report its findings in writing to the LAAC.
- d. The LAAC shall promptly convene a special meeting and decide whether accreditation should be withdrawn or sustained. At the discretion of the LAAC, the Visiting Team Chair may be requested to make a presentation to the Council.
- e. The LAAC decision and detailed summary of findings shall be provided in writing to the Program Administrator and the appropriate higher-level administrative officials of the institution.
- f. In the event the decision is to Withdraw Accreditation, the program is entitled to apply for reinstatement after a six-month period has elapsed. In this case, the typical procedures for re-accreditation shall be followed.

A decision to Withdraw Accreditation can be appealed in accordance with the Appeal Procedures outlined in Section 4.0.

3.29 Document Retention

The LAAC retains hard copy and electronic records in accordance with the CSLA Archiving Policy and Guidelines (approved July 11, 2013).

3.30 Accreditation Fees

LAAC fees are set at levels considered adequate to cover the costs of accreditation visits, all related program services, LAAC meeting costs, and all routine administrative expenses. Fees are reviewed annually and are subject to change with the approval of the CSLA Board of Directors. The current LAAC Schedule of Fees can be obtained from the Executive Director of the CSLA, 12 Forillon Crescent, Ottawa ON, K2M 2W5.

4.0 Appeal Procedure

4.1 Decisions Subject to Appeal

LAAC actions that are subject to appeal include only Denial of Accreditation or Withdrawal of Accreditation. In all such cases, the affected programs shall be notified of the LAAC action and of their right to appeal. Administrative Suspensions and Provisional Accreditations are actions that cannot be appealed.

4.2 Notice and Basis of Appeal

A written notice of appeal signed by the Dean of the College must be submitted to the Chair of the LAAC, with copies to the CSLA Board of Directors, within 20 days of notice of the LAAC action. The program must submit, within 60 days of the LAAC notice of action, a comprehensive written statement of the reasons for the appeal. Failure to submit this statement within the specified period is considered equivalent to withdrawing the appeal. During the appeal period, the accredited status of the program will not change.

LAAC decisions may only be contested on one or more of the following grounds:

- a. Procedures followed by the LAAC and Visiting Team did not conform to those defined in this document.
- b. An incorrect interpretation of the facts of the case was made by the Visiting Team.
- c. The standards for accreditation were applied incorrectly to these facts.

Appeals based on challenges to accreditation standards or procedures will be dismissed.

4.3 Appeal Panel

The CSLA Board shall conduct an enquiry and adjudicate the final accreditation decision. On receipt of the notice of appeal, the Board of Directors shall appoint a three-person panel, composed of members of the College of Fellows, to examine the decision. Fellows appointed to the appeal panel shall have demonstrated knowledge of and experience with the accreditation of educational institutions or programs. One member of the proposed appeal panel may be challenged by the program and a replacement will be appointed by the CSLA Board.

4.4 Decision of the Appeal Panel

The members of the appeal panel shall choose a chair from among themselves, and shall receive all relevant documents from both the LAAC and the program, including: the Self-Evaluation report, the Visiting Team Report, the notice of appeal by the program, and any other documents furnished by the program during the original inspection visit. The appeal panel shall interview representatives of the LAAC, the program and the Visiting Team. The appeal panel also has the discretion and authority to carry out an additional inspection visit to the program.

The appeal panel shall make its decision exclusively on the basis of the interviews, site visit and documents provided and cannot amend or overrule the published accreditation standards and procedures, which are properly the exclusive jurisdiction of the LAAC.

The panel shall reach a decision within two months following the receipt of the notice of appeal. They shall inform the Board of Directors, the program, and the LAAC of their decision concerning accreditation status and their reason for the decision. The panel's decision is final and there can be no further appeal.

4.5 Expenses of an Appeal

The program will bear the following expenses in connection with the appeal:

1. Travel, food, lodging and incidental expenses incurred by the appeal panel members and other individuals such as the original Visiting Team chair and a LAAC representative, and
2. Cost of the hearing room (if required).

A deposit must be made with the LAAC at the time of the filing of the notice of appeal. This deposit shall be based on a reasonable estimate of the anticipated appeal expenses and may be revised as needed in advance of the appeal.

Appendix A – Guidelines for the Digital Compendium of Student Work

CSLA Landscape Architecture Accreditation Council Electronic Presentation of Student Work and Review Guidelines

An important part of every accreditation visit is the evaluation of student work. To this end, the LAAC Standards and Procedures require that programs present a range of student work to demonstrate they are successfully delivering their curriculum and meeting their educational mission, goals, and stated learning outcomes. Typically, this presentation has taken the form of hard copy displays in studios, as well as other accessible display areas within the school premises.

Because the majority of student work is now done in an electronic format, it has become convenient and cost effective to replace hard copy displays with an electronic archive and to make this available on a confidential basis to the review team. Consequently, commencing with academic year 2015/16, the LAAC will require all programs to provide representative copies of past and current student work in a digital format. Notwithstanding, the Visiting Team retains the discretion to request the opportunity to review additional hard copy samples of student work while on campus.

The following specific guidelines are to be observed:

- The electronic display material must be issued concurrently with the final version of the Self-Evaluation Report.
- The display should be provided to the Visiting Team via a cloud-based file sharing system. If this is not possible, programs will be permitted to provide DVD's or thumb drives.
- While on campus, it is expected that the electronic archive will remain active and continuously accessible to the Visiting Team via a campus web link. This web link should also include copies of all course syllabi and should be dedicated exclusively, and securely, to the Visiting Team.
- The display shall include representative work of current students created during the past three academic years.
- The program may, at its discretion, also include work of an exemplary nature that provides a broad historical perspective on the program's evolution and current status within the academic and professional communities. This material should be clearly differentiated from the current student work folders.
- All electronic work should typically be provided in a PDF format (or similar) that allows the reviewers to access individual documents efficiently. Student work created in PowerPoint, should be converted to PDF format rather than the original software. PDF's should be able to be enlarged without becoming excessively pixilated or otherwise losing their legibility.
- Submissions should be organized in chronological order with a folder for each year of the program's curriculum, including separate folders for each course. A text file should also be included with each assignment to describe the problem statement, submission deliverables, and evaluation criteria and intended learning outcomes. Unless otherwise permitted by students, all names and other personal identification information should be redacted.
- The display should include examples of both design work and text-based projects.
- A minimum of three and a maximum of five, examples should be provided for each course.
- The submission should illustrate a range of student work for all courses and should include work drawn from each year of the previous three-year period.
- The selected examples should demonstrate the full range of student achievement from exemplary to minimum competency. At least one example should illustrate what the program considers to be of minimum competency. It is not necessary to display work that has received a failing grade.
- It is critical that a wide cross-section of student work be provided. The Visiting Team should not be shown repeat examples of work by the same exemplary student.
- The review teams should see the final product of any assignment, but should also understand how the student arrived at the end product. Consequently, it is encouraged that displays also include a full range of supporting and incidental background text and graphic work.
- The review team should be exposed to the full range of graphic techniques, both hand-drawn and digital, that are used by students. In the case of courses that include model building, digital photographs of representative models should be shown.

- For thesis, or capstone projects, it is acceptable to include web links to materials on the program's website, rather than copy the entire project.
- Team Room. The program should make sure the Visiting Team's room is set up with a digital projector and white wall or screen to allow them to view student work.

Appendix B – Conflict of Interest Policy and Declaration

**Landscape Architecture Accreditation Council
Visiting Team Member
Conflict of Interest Policy and Declaration**

Visiting Team Members must not:

- within the last five years have attended as a student or graduated from the program;
- within the last five years been employed by the program as a professor, associate professor, adjunct professor, visiting professor, sessional lecturer or similar position;
- be actively seeking or currently being considered for employment with the program;
- have served on an advisory, governing, research or evaluation body associated with the program within the last five years;
- been a collaborator or editor on a consulting project, book, journal article, report, paper or similar learned undertaking with any of the faculty of the program under review within the last five years;
- possess a pre-determined opinion regarding the quality and/or reputation of the program or any of its faculty that might adversely affect the objectivity of the review;
- have a family relationship with faculty, administrators, or current students of the program;
- have close personal or professional relationships with faculty in the program; or
- possess a monetary or personal interest in the outcome of the accreditation decision;

I solemnly declare that I have read and understood the above policy and do not, to the best of my knowledge, have a Conflict of Interest that would disqualify me or otherwise adversely affect my judgment as a Visiting Team member in the accreditation review panel for the:

Program: _____

Institution: _____

Signature _____

Date _____

For further information about the LAAC, please contact:

laac-caap@csla-aapc.ca

12 Forillon, Ottawa ON K2M 2W5

1-866-781-9799

To obtain a printed copy of this document, contact:

Michelle Legault, Executive Director
Canadian Society of Landscape Architects

executive-director@csla-aapc.ca

www.csla-aapc.ca

Pour des renseignements supplémentaires concernant le CAAP, veuillez communiquer avec :

laac-caap@csla-aapc.ca

12 Forillon, Ottawa (ON) K2M 2W5

1-866-781-9799

Pour obtenir une copie imprimée de ce document, veuillez communiquer avec:

Michelle Legault, directrice générale
L'Association des architectes paysagistes du Canada

executive-director@csla-aapc.ca

www.csla-aapc.ca

