

**ACCREDITATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS IN PLANNING:  
A GUIDE FOR THE INITIAL AND PERIODIC INTENSIVE REVIEW OF  
POST SECONDARY DEGREE PROGRAMS IN PLANNING**

**Prepared for Site Visit Teams**

**Membership Committee and Registrar  
Ontario Professional Planners Institute**

# **ACCREDITATION OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS IN PLANNING: A GUIDE FOR THE INITIAL AND PERIODIC INTENSIVE REVIEW OF POST SECONDARY DEGREE PROGRAMS IN PLANNING**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Canadian Institute of Planners (CIP) in partnership with its Provincial and Regional Affiliates is responsible for the accreditation of academic programs in planning in Canada. CIP utilizes a modified version of accreditation - *recognition* - to formally assess and acknowledge the quality of qualifying academic degrees awarded during specific periods of time.

The Canadian Institute of Planners, as a nationally chartered organization, is committed to maintaining an interest in the university system in which the majority of the professional planners in Canada are educated. Through the National/Affiliate Membership Committee, CIP establishes national standards for accreditation and oversees the initial and periodic reviews of academic programs seeking to acquire accreditation for the first time or to maintain an existing accreditation status. The accreditation review process itself is delivered by the Provincial or Regional Affiliate organization. In addition to an intensive initial and periodic review process, accredited planning curricula must also file an annual report to maintain their accreditation standing.

With the assistance of Provincial and Regional Affiliate planning organizations and the Association of Canadian University Planning Programs (ACUPP), CIP endeavours to support the development of formal planning education in Canada through fostering the involvement of students in university level planning studies, through the support of academic Members in the planning programs, and by contributing to the continuing evolution of planning practice and the articulation of appropriate principles, philosophy and ethical standards.

## **THE ROLE OF THE ONTARIO PROFESSIONAL PLANNERS INSTITUTE**

As an affiliate of the Canadian Institute of Planners, the Ontario Professional Planners Institute (OPPI) is jointly responsible for the accreditation of university planning programs. The Membership Committee oversees the annual recognition renewal process and the periodic intensive reviews of currently accredited planning program. The OPPI Membership Committee is also responsible for administering the review of any new planning program being put forth for consideration for initial accreditation.

Through the Membership Committee, recommendations are prepared for an initial or renewal of a period of accreditation for academic planning programs based on submitted reports from the Site Visit Teams. Through OPPI Council, these recommendations are forwarded to the National/Affiliate Membership Committee of CIP and then to CIP Council which makes the final determination on accreditation status.

## THE PROCESS

Volume 3 of the Membership Manual of the Canadian Institute of Planners sets out the process and criteria for initial, annual and periodic intensive reviews of academic programs in planning. A copy is enclosed. This guide has been prepared to assist Site Visit Teams in undertaking the review of planning programs by offering clarification on the process described in the Membership Manual.<sup>1</sup>

The process of accreditation of academic planning programs is based on four underlying principles:

- the degree is in planning, as defined by CIP;
- the department or planning school has the administrative capacity and academic independence to control and deliver its program;
- that Members of the professional Institute are significantly involved in the delivery of teaching in the planning curriculum; and
- that course content includes "what planners need to know".

The first three criteria are addressed by seven "administrative" standards applied for both the annual and periodic reviews. The degree to which university planning programs adhere to these principles has been an ongoing source of "tension" between the planning Institutes and those academic institutions delivering planning curricula. While CIP acknowledges the independence of universities to set curriculum and academic policies and to structure its own administration and academic units, universities must acknowledge that the accreditation process and standards are the sole responsibility of the profession.

As to the fourth criteria - minimum program content - CIP recognizes that a university can never teach everything a planner needs to know. To begin with, work experience is a fundamental and complementary part of a planner's training as is a program of ongoing continuous professional learning.

In regards to academic preparation, the Institute respects the university's role in deciding what it believes students need to learn in order to be well-rounded citizens, and what it believes planning students need to learn. Furthermore, each university responds to regional needs, market conditions, and demand for post-secondary education. As a result each university may specialize in different fields of planning over time in response to regional need and to the advancement of the profession.

---

### <sup>1</sup> **A Major Review of Standards is Now Underway**

It must be noted that CIP in concert with its Affiliate organizations is currently engaged in a major review of membership standards and procedures which when completed will significantly alter the current standards for member competencies, ethical practice, certification requirements and university program accreditation. The process and standards to be used to assess academic programs for initial and ongoing accreditation will undergo significant change as a result.

However, the Institute, as the voice of the profession, has a duty to identify the knowledge, skills and competencies that professional planners require, and to require that degree programs include these as a condition of accreditation. Therefore, in making a decision on whether to recognize a degree the Institute will judge whether the course content effectively addresses the four overlapping categories of essential substantive knowledge: process, content, context, and role. The Institute will also judge whether the courses teach a sufficient number and quality of skills. These are currently described in the CIP Membership Manual and are included in this guide..

### **The Administrative Standards Applied for an Initial Assessment for Accreditation, and for Annual and Intensive Periodic Reviews**

Based on CIP experience gained over a fifty plus year period, the Institute now sees the need to clarify both the administrative and program content requirements for programs currently recognized and for those contemplating seeking accreditation. The review of all membership standards and procedures now underway will serve to establish new norms and requirements for university accreditation. In the meantime, the Institute provides interpretations of existing standards and criteria to assist Site Visit Committees and universities currently considering the creation of a curriculum in planning and a future application for accreditation of such programs. OPPI requires that Site Visit Committees thoroughly consider these criteria in their review of both new and existing programs.

In meeting their annual review requirements, accredited programs shall report on their program status with respect to the Administrative Standards and identify any significant changes which have occurred since the previous annual report or periodic intensive review.

### **Administrative Standards**

The degree shall be established by a post-secondary educational institution recognized by a Government of a Province of Canada.
---

#### *Interpretation:*

As the national planning organization, CIP undertakes the process of accreditation for Canadian academic programs only. As a result CIP is unlike other national planning bodies, including the Planning Accreditation Board of the United States, which will administer their accreditation to schools in other national jurisdictions. While this CIP standard does not preclude the development of joint programs from more than one academic institution, even when located in different jurisdictions, the degree award must be from a Canadian post-secondary educational institution.

The degree must be in the field of planning, planning being defined as “the scientific, aesthetic and orderly disposition of land, resources, facilities and services with a view to securing the physical, economic, and social efficiency, health and well being of urban and rural communities”.

*Interpretation:*

In their proposal for initial recognition, university planning programs seeking recognition from CIP must clearly state how the program meets the stated definition of the academic field and realm of practice. They must also articulate through their statement of goals and objectives for the program how it complies with the CIP program content requirements as defined by the accrediting body within the broader framework of their own university or institutional goals and/or mission statements. While the definition of planning is broad - and deliberately so - it should not be construed as being all inclusive or simply a listing from which certain program attributes or foci may be selected.

Planning is a future-oriented and comprehensive process. It seeks to link knowledge and action in ways which improve the quality of public and private development and of decisions affecting people and their environment. Because of its future orientation, planning embraces visionary and idealistic thinking, yet also recognizes that the implementation of plans requires the reconciliation of present realities to futures states.

Programs seeking renewal of their accreditation status should also address these matters thoroughly in their Self Assessment documentation which is prepared for the Site Visit Team.

A Bachelor’s degree in planning should require at least four years or equivalent in a normal case (except in Quebec where it is normally 3 years following CEGEP).  
A Master’s degree in planning should require at least two years or equivalent of study in a normal case.

*Interpretation:*

As a point of entry to the profession, CIP defines the four year Bachelor’s Degree as the minimum academic credential required. Where the planning curriculum is housed in a faculty where the traditional degree nomenclature for a four year degree is an “Honours Degree”, then this designation shall be viewed as the minimum credential required. At the graduate level, two year programs with a thesis or major research paper requirement are the expected norm.

However, other formats have also been accredited. These include a Bachelor’s Degree in Planning of two years duration after a completed baccalaureate degree, and a one year (three academic semesters) Masters Degree for candidates with an accredited undergraduate planning degree and a minimum of two years of practical planning experience.

All new program proposals built on curriculum models other than the four year undergraduate and two year graduate offerings must undergo a rigorous review by the National/Affiliate Membership Committee of CIP and the Affiliate Membership/Registration Committee.

The word “planning” or the French equivalent shall appear in the title of the degree or parenthetically to identify the discipline of planning within the designated branch of knowledge (Science, Arts, Environmental Studies, etc.) and shall not be subordinate to another discipline within that branch of knowledge (Geography, Architecture, Biology, etc).

*Interpretation:*

Degree designations such as Urban and Rural/Regional Studies, Urban Studies, Urban Development, Community Studies or the like, are not appropriate degree designations for an accredited planning program. Degree designations which subordinate the planning curriculum to another discipline or professional degree (Bachelor of Arts (Geography) with a specialization or minor in Planning) are also not appropriate. The degree designation should clearly identify the field of study to be planning. Programs proposing a degree designation that does not satisfy this standard will not normally be considered for accreditation.

The program offering the degree in planning shall be a recognizable administrative unit within the educational institution, in the direct charge of an individual whose substantive qualifications are in planning and who is officially designated by the educational institution as the responsible executive academic officer of the unit having authority on academic matters at least equivalent to that of a department chair.

*Interpretation*

In the opinion of the Institute, the long term viability of an accredited planning program is based on the administrative independence and capacity of the program unit responsible for the curriculum, the qualifications of the executive administrative officer of the unit, the academic and professional qualifications of the teaching faculty, and the existence of a critical mass of teaching, staff, space/equipment and budget resources.

An accredited planning program shall be headed by an individual whose substantive qualifications are in planning. This executive administrative officer shall have authority on academic matters at least equivalent to that of a Departmental Chair or School Director in regards to curriculum development, faculty hiring and considerations for promotion and tenure, budget, the assignment of teaching within the unit, recruitment, and representation of the planning degree program both within the educational institution and with the external community. It is the clear preference of the accrediting body that new planning offerings

are established as independent departments or schools with their administrative executive officer reporting directly to a Dean or Vice-President Academic/Provost.

It has been the experience of the Institute that small, minimally resourced programs which are embedded within other departmental units do not attain the critical mass or independence necessary to fully evolve into mature, successful programs. Programs which are not based on an integrated planning curriculum delivered in the majority by a faculty with academic and professional qualifications in planning have consistently struggled to attain long term viability.

As a result of this experience, the Institute is now reviewing its policies and standards with respect to the accreditation of academic programs. Proposed offerings which address only the minimum requirements for accreditation will be carefully scrutinized.

The faculty shall include at least three academic members whose major appointments are in the planning program.
---

*Interpretation*

This standard sets the floor for academic appointments to the planning offering. A minimum of three faculty members, one being the executive academic officer, shall have their academic appointment to the university to the planning degree program. Faculty cross-appointments to other academic or research units within the university, or secondments from other units to the planning program, will not be counted toward this minimum. Adjunct faculty appointments will also not be counted towards this minimum.

As these faculty appointments are to the planning degree program, it is the expectation of the accrediting body that individuals holding these appointments have appropriate academic credentials in the planning field. This is interpreted to mean holding at least one degree in planning. Programs populated by faculty without appropriate academic credentials in planning will not be accredited. Programs falling below this floor of appropriately qualified faculty shall be deemed to be in non compliance with the accreditation requirements.

It is also the position of the accrediting body that members of the professional institute be engaged in the delivery of the academic program. Individuals appointed to the teaching faculty should hold professional qualifications as well. This is addressed in the following standard.

At least three “full time equivalent” faculty members of the degree granting institution must be Members; at least two of whom must have their “major appointment” in the planning program. Two or more members with part-time teaching appointments in the planning program may be considered to be equivalent to one of these full time equivalents

### *Interpretation*

This standard sets the floor for the involvement of members of the professional institute in the delivery of the planning degree program. No fewer than three Full Members of CIP must be appointed to the university, at least two of whom must have their major appointment to the university with the planning degree program. While faculty on sabbatical or parental leave may be counted for the purpose of meeting this requirement, faculty seconded or promoted to other duties in the university or on long-term unpaid or disability leave may not be counted. Professors Emeriti will also not be counted.

In instances where this minimum level of Member involvement in the planning degree offering is not achieved, two part-time teaching appointments to the program held by individuals with the MCIP designation shall be considered to be one of these full time equivalents. However, only one full time equivalent may be satisfied in this manner. The ongoing use of part-time appointments to attain the minimum MCIP complement is not acceptable.

In instances where the level of Member involvement in the planning program, including the use of two part-time appointments as an FTE equivalent, falls below the minimum, the program shall be deemed to be in non-compliance with the accreditation requirements.

## **ANNUAL REVIEW**

OPPI shall administer the process of annual review of degrees which shall be completed by no later than July 31<sup>st</sup> with notification to CIP and the universities.

The Membership Committee will conduct an annual review of accredited planning degrees. The purpose of the annual review is to monitor the program and identify any changes that may have taken place since the previous annual report or intensive periodic review. The annual review shall also address how the program has, or is in the process of, responding to requirements identified within the previous periodic intensive review process to maintain accreditation.

The annual report may identify changes which are sufficiently significant to trigger a periodic review, and in the extreme could result in the revocation of accreditation.

The annual report shall be prepared on the form provided by OPPI and shall at a minimum provide detail on the administrative criteria as identified in CIP By-law No. 1, Schedule A Section 8.6.

Annual reports are to be reviewed by the OPPI Membership Committee. Upon completion of the review the Chair of the committee shall submit a letter to the CIP National/Affiliate Membership Committee, copied to OPPI Council, which identifies the degree being recognized by CIP, provides a summary of the action taken by the Committee to comply with the requirements of the annual review, and makes a recommendation with respect to the program which may include observations, an analysis of strengths and weaknesses, and recommendations for appropriate improvements. A copy of the letter should be sent to the university.

## **PERIODIC INTENSIVE REVIEW**

A periodic intensive review will be undertaken by OPPI every seven years or less to ensure that the course content and administrative criteria fulfill the requirements of accreditation by CIP. In conducting the review, the CIP Bylaw no.1, Schedule A, Section 8.6, the Appendix IV of the CIP Membership manual Volume 3, and the OPPI Guide to the Accreditation of Planning Programs are to be recognized and followed.

Wherever possible the periodic intensive review shall be scheduled in relation to a time when the program is also being reviewed by others, such as the university or a provincial ministry responsible for post-secondary education, so that the development of the self-assessment document by the university can take advantage of documentation prepared for these internal or external reviews.

The role of the OPPI Membership Committee in the periodic intensive review will be to:

- a. Provide results for all annual reviews following the last major review;
- b. Conduct an initial meeting with the University to discuss the major review process, clarifies the self-evaluation report documentation requirements and discusses potential nominees for the Site Visit Committee; and
- c. The affiliate may also seek the evaluation of employers, graduates and students and provide the results to the university for discussion;
- d. Provide support in assembling review material for the Site Visit Committee including this guide and Volume 3: CIP Membership Manual, in gathering opinions on the planning programs and in identifying recommended or required actions placed on the program to be reviewed stemming from past periodic intensive or annual reviews.

The periodic intensive review shall be completed by a Site Visit Committee (SVC). The SVC shall spend at least one day on the campus of the university at a mutually convenient time during the academic year. An additional day may be required for the site visit where a program is undergoing an initial review for accreditation, where multiple programs (for example Undergraduate and Graduate) are simultaneously undergoing review, or where progress on previously recommended actions or conditions of a past intensive or annual review must be assessed.

## **THE SITE VISIT COMMITTEE**

The Membership Committee shall oversee the creation of a Site Visit Committee to conduct an initial or periodic intensive review process. The SVC shall consist of the following members:

- a Member appointed by the affiliate who shall serve as the SVC Chair and who shall be a sitting member of the Membership Committee wherever possible;
- a Member nominated by the University and acceptable to the Membership Committee; and
- a Member from out-of-the affiliate acceptable to the University, the Affiliate and CIP.

The Chair of the SVC will be the principal contact with the University to determine along with the program Chair or Director an appropriate date(s), agenda and schedule for the site visit..

The role of the out-of-affiliate Member shall be to represent the National interest. The cost of the out-of-affiliate Member shall be borne by the university. All members of the Site Visit Committee must be Full Members of CIP and in good standing in the Institute. The appointees shall be persons with substantial experience and performance in the field of planning.

### ***Prior to the Site Visit***

Prior to the site visit, the program seeking approval shall prepare a self- evaluation report which shall address the manner in which the program meets CIP requirements with respect to the knowledge and skills the Institute requires a professional planner to have, and the administrative criteria of the Institute. The self-evaluation report will identify any changes since the last annual review and any changes since the last periodic intensive review. It will also address the progress made on any issues or conditions established through the last intensive periodic review.

The self-evaluation report should also include:

- the stated mandate, vision statement and/or goals of the planning program;
- a brief history of the planning program;
- a copy of the university calendar description for the planning program;
- a discussion of the curriculum outlining the structure, total credit requirements, total planning course requirements, promotion and graduation requirements;
- course syllabi for all planning courses within the curriculum;
- curriculum vitae for all faculty delivering the planning courses within the program curriculum;
- a list of faculty delivering the planning program identifying the specifics of their appointment to the university and percentage of their faculty responsibilities to the planning program (e.g. appointed to the planning program 100% or cross appointed to the planning program 50% and the Sociology Department 50%)

The self-evaluation report shall also provide a list of all courses offered within the program curriculum identifying the faculty who taught each course in the previous academic year along with their academic and professional credentials.

It is highly recommended that programs seeking an initial accreditation or renewal of their accreditation status undertake a curriculum mapping exercise to identify where specifically within the program curriculum the knowledge, skills and ethics content requirements are being delivered.

The site visit committee shall be provided with all relevant documentation from the program and the affiliate by no later than 14 days prior to the site visit and the Committee may confer in advance.

Members of the Site Visit Committee must be familiar with Volume 3 of the CIP membership manual and Schedule A of the By-law, this guide, and must review material prepared by the university. The university submission must be reviewed to ensure that the base requirements set out in CIP manual have been fulfilled. This information must be verified during the site visit to ensure that it is current and correct. The chair of the Site Visit Committee should contact each other member in advance to arrange a meeting prior to formally commencing the site visit.

### **Travel and Accommodation Arrangements**

Each member of the Site Visit Committee is responsible for making his/her own travel arrangements. Travel shall be whatever means (rail, air, bus or auto) as deemed reasonable in terms of convenience, comfort and expense. Travel arrangements should be made well in advance to take advantage of discount fares, if possible. The host university will make arrangements for lodging, accommodations and any meals expected to occur at the university.

Site Visit Committee members must collect receipts for all expenses associated with the visit. The costs for the site visit shall be borne by the university. Any questions regarding expenses should be directed to the program chair of the host university.

### **THE SITE VISIT**

In brief the schedule of the site visit shall include the program presentation to the site visit committee based on its written statement addressing the manner in which the program addresses the knowledge and skills criteria, the opportunity for the SVC to meet with faculty members, students, and other officials of the university, and an opportunity to review the program facilities.

The University will be represented by at least three faculty members from the Planning Program, one of whom is the Program Director. The Program Director will be the principal contact with the SVC.

The Site Visit shall normally begin with a formal presentation by the representatives of the university program based on the self-evaluation report and other supporting documentation. The presentation is followed by a discussion on the presentation, on materials provided prior to the site visit and on any other matters pertaining to the review.

The SVC shall also be provided with a scheduled meeting(s) with the appropriate Dean or Vice-President Academic/Provost. All teaching faculty within the planning program will be available to meet with the SVC during the site visit and an appropriate time period shall be scheduled for such individual meetings. The SVC should also have the opportunity for interaction with students enrolled in the planning program.

Accommodation should also be made within the site visit schedule for the SVC to review the facilities and resources of the program and the university that support the planning curriculum.

Opportunities for the SVC to meet privately during the day shall also be scheduled (perhaps in association with a scheduled lunch period and just prior to the final debriefing session with the university representatives) to allow the committee to begin work on their recommendations and report.

A final debriefing session shall be scheduled to conclude the site visit.

In their review of the program, members of the Site Visit Committee shall assess whether the planning program meets the Administrative Standards Criteria as set out in Volume 3 of the CIP Membership Manual. Whether any outstanding issues or conditions identified in a previous periodic intensive review have been adequately addressed shall also be assessed.

The SVC will also consider the following:

**Quality:**

The program's curriculum shall be of high quality to ensure and up-to-date understanding of the field and the development of state-of-the-art planning skills by its graduate.

**Goals:**

Planning programs seeking recognition from CIP must clearly state their goals and objectives with respect to complying with the CIP program content requirements as stated in this document within the broader framework of their own university or institutional goals and/or mission statements. Further, the program's curriculum shall be configured consistently with the stated goals and objectives.

**Components:**

The components of a program shall address knowledge, skills and ethical values as follows:

**Minimum Program Content Requirements**

Decisions on planning program accreditation also require a thorough assessment of how a program's curriculum provides students with the knowledge, skills and ethical values necessary for becoming professional planning practitioners.

To become effective and ethical practitioners, students must develop a comprehensive understanding of communities and regions, and of the theory and practice of planning. Students must also understand how planning affects individual and community values, and must be aware of their own roles in this process.

Programs seeking an initial accreditation must thoroughly document how the proposed planning curriculum is to satisfy the requisite knowledge, skills and ethical standards requirements. The use of a “curriculum mapping exercise” which describes in detail the courses to be included in the program curriculum and where the specific knowledge, skills and ethical standards content are to be delivered is highly recommended.

Programs seeking a renewal of their accreditation are also encouraged to prepare the curriculum map for inclusion within their self-assessment document. A summary of all courses offered within the planning program over the period since the last periodic intensive review was completed should also be included with the self-assessment report.

## **KNOWLEDGE COMPONENTS**

### *Structure & Function of Human Settlements*

#### *Guideline:*

This subject area should include:

- knowledge of human settlement itself, its evolution and history, geography, economy, changing forms and political and social structure;
- an understanding of local government, finance, and land use;
- an understanding of the broad principles that guide the design and operation of infrastructure and services;
- an understanding of the roles of economic development and social service provisions, including housing.

### *History and Principles of Community Planning Processes and Practices*

#### *Guideline:*

This subject area should include:

- knowledge of the theories, ideals and principles which have guided community planning;
- approaches to and methods of policy analysis;
- history of community planning;
- and community planning practice.

Planning should be examined as a decision making process in a political environment. This typically includes:

- an understanding of the strengths, limitations, and uncertainties associated with the political, social, environmental, cultural and economic nature of public interest and the roles of professional judgment, expertise and advice within these frameworks;
- an understanding of the historical evolution of community planning as a function of government, as a professional activity, and as a reform movement.

### *Legislative, Legal, Political and Administrative Aspects of Planning and Policy Implementation*

#### *Guideline:*

This subject area should include:

- the contexts in which planning takes place, focusing on enabling legislation, agencies conducting planning or employing planners, and the processes by which plans are made and implemented.

### *Methods of Policy Implementation and Planning*

#### *Guideline:*

This subject area should include:

- methods for implementing public policy and community planning within the framework of Canadian law and the process of local government - it includes planning law, community development plans, zoning and other implementation techniques, governmental systems, political and organizational behaviour, public finance principles, evaluation methods and impact assessment;
- knowledge of, and familiarity with, the role and methods of public consultation and involvement in decision making and understanding of the concepts of community based development.

### *Environmental and Ecological Aspects of Planning*

#### *Guideline:*

This subject area should include:

- an understanding of biophysical environments and systems;
- an understanding of the relationship between ecological, social and economic factors in planning including the concepts of sustainable development.

### *Roles and Responsibilities of Planners*

#### *Guideline:*

This area should:

- enable students to understand the roles, relationships and responsibilities of planners within the broader society.

## **SKILLS COMPONENTS**

### *Problem Identification, Research Skills, and Data Gathering*

#### *Guideline:*

This subject area should address the ability to identify problems from complex actual situations.

Sub-areas include the ability to:

- design research frameworks and conduct research;
- gain competence in a variety of research techniques including case study methods, survey design and data gathering methods such as observation, open ended interviewing and the design of questionnaires
- familiarity with information sources commonly used by planners

### *Analytical Skills*

#### *Guideline:*

This subject area should address:

- the ability to apply statistical and other analytical methods and techniques, to define planning problems, forecast future needs, generate alternatives, and evaluate their consequences;
- the ability to apply principles and rules of classification (sorting, grouping, categorizing), logic (inductive and deductive reasoning) and empiricism in undertaking analysis and in reporting results;
- the ability to apply methods of policy and program analysis and evaluation to identify outcomes such as benefits and costs (including differential distribution of benefits and costs).

### *Written, Oral, and Graphic Communications Skills*

#### *Guideline:*

This subject area should address:

- the ability to communicate effectively in written, spoken, and visual terms;
- the drafting of technical, advisory and regulatory reports and other documents used as a basis for decision making.

### *Collaborative Problem Solving Skills*

#### *Guideline:*

This subject area should address:

- the ability to work effectively as leaders and members of multi-disciplinary teams, and to understand interpersonal and group dynamics to assure effective group action - the subject area should also include an understanding of group processes, as well as mediation and negotiation skills;
- knowledge of and familiarity with the role and methods of public consultation and involvement in decision making and an understanding of the concepts of community based development.

## **THE DECISION OF THE SITE VISIT COMMITTEE**

The Site Visit Committee shall make a decision in writing no later than one month following the visit, and submit it to the OPPI Membership Committee and to the university.

Possible decisions are:

- approval;
- approval with conditions to be fulfilled prior to the next content review;
- refusal, with an explanation of what is needed before approval can be given.

## **Committee Report**

The report of the Site Visit Committee should at a minimum include the following:

- the degrees recognized by the Canadian Institute of Planners;
- a brief introduction outlining the dates and location of the site visit;
- an evaluation of the planning program with respect to Section 8.6 of Schedule A - National Membership Criteria of the CIP membership manual;
- conclusion and recommendations.

The conclusions and Recommendations section must clearly set out the Committee's recommendation for recognition.

The report may include observations, strengths and weaknesses of the program, and recommendations for appropriate improvements.

The final report should be signed by all members of the Site Visit Committee.

A copy of a university submission should be attached for information.

The report is to be submitted to the affiliate and the university by no later than one month following the site visit.

## **APPEALS**

Appeals must be made in writing within thirty days of the decision being rendered. Appeals shall be addressed c/o the Registrar, Ontario Professional Planners Institute and may be submitted by Registered Mail, Courier, or electronic transmission.

In the event of an appeal, OPPI Council will review the University's letter of appeal and the SVC's decision letter and will make a decision on the basis of its review within thirty days of receiving the appeal. The Council's decision will be in writing. The Registrar of OPPI will forward Council's decision to the Program Director with copies to the Dean of the Faculty and to the Chair of the SVC.

If no further appeal is lodged with the National Council of CIP within thirty days of receiving notification of OPPI Council's decision, OPPI Council's decision will be considered the final decision on whether the degree program is given CIP recognition.

## **APPLICATION FEE**

All costs associated with an Intensive Periodic Review site visit will be the responsibility of the University as outlined in Section 3.4 of the CIP Membership Manual Volume 3.

OPPI will be responsible for setting the application fee for the initial recognition, the periodic intensive review, and for the annual review. The fees shall be established by OPPI Council.

The CIP fee for degree recognition is set by CIP Council from time to time.

University planning programs shall be provided with the appropriate fee schedule at the beginning of each academic year.

For a full list of all Canadian University Planning Programs recognized by The Institute, please go to [http://www.cip-icu.ca/English/academic/cdn\\_uni.htm](http://www.cip-icu.ca/English/academic/cdn_uni.htm)

For a full list of all University Planning Programs recognized by the Planning Accreditation Board on behalf of the American Institute of Certified Planners, please go to [http://www.cip-icu.ca/English/academic/rec\\_uni.htm](http://www.cip-icu.ca/English/academic/rec_uni.htm) and follow the links.

---

***Application for Recognition of University Degrees***

The Institute has a policy of expressly recognizing certain Canadian university degrees in Planning providing these meet the standards established by the Institute. This form is for the use of Universities who wish CIP recognition of their degrees. This form should be completed in full and submitted to the appropriate CIP Affiliate. The Affiliate should be in receipt of the form prior to June 15th each year for the following academic year.

<b>University</b>	
<b>Department</b>	
<b>Head</b>	
<b>Planning Degree(s) offered</b>	
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Response</b>
1. The degree shall be established by a post-secondary educational institution recognized by a Government of a Province of Canada.	
2. The degree must be in the field of planning, planning being described as "the scientific, aesthetic and orderly disposition of land, resources, facilities and services with a view to securing the physical, economic and social efficiency, health and well-being of urban and rural communities".	
3. A Bachelor's degree in planning should require at least four years or equivalent in a normal case, A Master's degree in planning shall require at least two years or equivalent of study in a normal case.	Indicate number of years of study for degree(s) granted
4. The word "planning" or the French equivalent shall appear in the title of the degree or parenthetically to identify the discipline of planning within the designated branch of knowledge (Science, Arts, Environmental Studies, etc.) and shall not be subordinate to another discipline within that branch of knowledge (Geography, Architecture, Biology, etc.). (see chart)	Indicate title of degree(s) granted

<p>5. The program offering the degree in planning shall be a recognizable administrative unit within the educational institution, in the direct charge of an individual whose substantive qualifications are in planning and who is officially designated by the educational institution as the responsible executive academic officer of the unit having authority on academic matters at least equivalent to that of a department chair.</p>	<p>Outline your administrative structure and the qualifications of the Academic Officer</p>
<p>6. The faculty shall include at least three academic members whose major appointments are in the planning program.</p>	<p>List names of faculty members teaching full-time in the planning program.</p>
<p>7. At least three “full time equivalent” faculty members of the degree granting institution must be Members; at least two of who must have their “major appointment” in the planning program. Faculty Member on sabbatical or parental leave are to be included for the purpose of meeting this requirement. Two or more members with part-time teaching appointments in the planning program shall be considered to be one of these full-time equivalents.</p>	<p>List names of faculty members who are CIP members, indicating full or part-time.</p>

8. To facilitate the annual review of the foregoing information, *briefly* identify the most significant changes in the past year. If previous recognition was granted with conditions or recommendations, indicate how they have responded to.
9. If this is an intensive periodic review, provide a self-evaluation report which shall address the manner in which the program meets CIP requirements with respect to knowledge and skills the Institute requires a professional planner to have.