



**The Alberta
Association of
Architects**

Architects and Licensed Interior Designers

Interior Design Legislation Review Task Force Recommendations

November 2019

Contents

Introduction 3

Executive Summary 4

RECOMMENDATIONS 5

 Issue 1 – Title Protection 5

 Issue 2 – Scope Definition 7

 Issue 3 – Name of Association 9

 Issue 4 – Representation 10

 Issue 5 – Use of Terms 13

Consultations 14

The contents of this document are confidential to the person to whom it is addressed and should not be disclosed to any other person or entity. It may not be reproduced in whole, or in part, nor may any of the information contained therein be disclosed without the prior written consent of the Alberta Association of Architects. Any form of reproduction, dissemination, copying, disclosure, modification, distribution and or publication of this material is strictly prohibited.

November 28, 2019

Introduction

This report has been prepared by the Interior Design Legislation Task Force (Task Force) as one element of the Alberta Association of Architects (AAA) review of the Architects Act and General Regulation.

The members of the Interior Design Legislation Task Force are:

- Natasha Jalbert, Licensed Interior Designer – Chair
- Adele Bonetti, Licensed Interior Designer
- Georgi-Anna Sizeland, Licensed Interior Designer
- Paula Dozois, Educator
- Cory Riley, Licensed Interior Designer
- Peter Osborne, Registered Architect
- Barbara Bruce, Executive Director

The Task Force came together in 2018 in response to a concern expressed about the lack of specific perspective on matters that would concern the Licensed Interior Design (LID) membership of the AAA. Each of the other Legislation Review Task Forces had included a LID member for that perspective, but it was acknowledged that an overall LID view of the legislation had not been sought.

The Task Force began meeting in 2018 and reviewed the *Architects Act* and *General Regulation* with a view to considering how the profession of Licensed Interior Design should be represented in the future legislation. The process was one of extensive review of the legislation, sharing of views, and research on how interior design is represented in legislation across the country. An early conversation with AAA Council in March of 2019 further informed the direction of the work being done by the Task Force.

A series of recommendations was prepared, and stakeholder consultations followed to test the recommendations. Several of the recommendations were widely accepted as logical outcomes of thoughtful review. However, the most contentious one, Protection of Title, was hotly debated.

It is worth noting that this report has been prepared for discussion at the November 2019 Council meeting with a view to avoiding further delay in the process of policy development towards legislation renewal. However, the Task Force would like Council to know that depending on the discussion at the Council table around Protection of Title, additional work may need to be done around stakeholder consultation. Should time permit this additional consultation, the Task Force would recommend that this be done.

The Interior Design Legislation Task Force is pleased to present the following recommendation report for Council's consideration.

Executive Summary

Following a review of the governing legislation for the profession, a series of five recommendations were made:

Issue 1 – Title Protection

The task force is recommending a new title altogether that would more accurately reflect the nature of the scope of work currently done by LIDs: ***Interior Architect***. This title is being suggested as a way to eliminate the public confusion around the various references to interior designers used in the marketplace today.

It is recognized that this would be a bold move for the AAA. Some stakeholders are wholly in favor of this approach (Mount Royal University – Interior Design Program) while others are opposed (University of Calgary - SAPL). Others debated this matter passionately and thoughtfully and presented arguments on both sides, without settling on one or the other (interior designer or interior architect).

Everyone agreed that the status quo of Licensed Interior Designer is problematic and a concern for public safety since the public (and many authorities having jurisdiction) do not understand when a professional is required on a project and that the LID is the ONLY type of interior designer qualified for such projects.

Passionate voices sit on each side of the issue, and the Task Force itself was not unanimous on their recommendation.

Issue 2 – Scope Definition

The Task Force is not recommending any substantive changes to the scope. However, they have noted that the definition should be edited slightly so that it uses inclusive language rather than the negative, exclusive language. Minor wording changes would accomplish this.

The location within the legislation for scope definition should also be the same for both professions. It may be desirable for various reasons to put both in the *General Regulation* (where it is easier to update the definition as the profession evolves) or both in the *Architects Act* (where it sets the tone for everything to follow). The Task Force simply felt that both definitions should be together.

Issue 3 – Name of Association

It was recognized that the name: *Alberta Association of Architects* does not currently reflect the inclusion of Licensed Interior Designers. It is agreed that once the matter of Protected Title is decided regarding LIDs or Interior Architects, that the title of the association should better reflect the membership. Various options for names are suggested in this report.

Issue 4 – Representation

The *Architects Act* delegates the privilege of self-regulation to the AAA. The current legislation is inconsistent in how it represents the regulation of interior design in regards to regulatory functions. The proportion of LIDs on Council, on the Complaints Review Committee and the Practice Review Board for example is specified in a way that is limiting. In other sections of the legislation the representation is more generous. The underlying philosophy recommended by the Task Force is that this segment of the membership be more equitably

represented, and that their perspective be honored, especially when LID members are the subject of disciplinary process.

Issue 5 – Use of Terms

It may be an artifact of the haste in which interior designers were added to the legislation, but there are many places throughout the Act and General Regulation where references to LIDs and architects is inconsistent. In some cases, there are gaps where assumptions must be made that a rule that applies to an architect member must logically apply to a LID member. The Task Force noted that care must be taken in drafting the new legislation for more considerate use of language for inclusiveness, clarity and consistency.

General

The Task Force appreciates the work done by other legislation review task forces in the various areas related to regulation of the professions. The work done by this task force was specific to the LID membership and how their profession is represented. They appreciate the opportunity and time to reflect on these matters and bring them forward for Council's consideration.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Issue 1 – Title Protection

1.1 Current Legislation

Currently the title of Licensed Interior Designer (LID) is protected under the *Architects Act* and *General Regulation*. The current title relies on a qualifier (Licensed) to the title of interior design to indicate that this profession has protected title and scope.

The title of Registered Interior Designer (RID) is used by the Interior Designers of Alberta whose organization was established under a private member's bill. This bill allows them to establish categories of membership, and they have a category called RID. The bill applies only to their membership, and does not give them authority over anyone who is not a member of their association. As such, it is not truly a protected title. There is no protected scope affiliated with this title.

The term of interior designer is not protected in Alberta. Anyone with (or without) any level of education or experience can use this term.

1.2 Issues

The Licensed Interior Design qualifier is not used elsewhere in Canada. It is not recognized by other provinces nor by other interior design associations.

The public doesn't understand the difference between the types of interior designers, and the level of awareness of the protected titles for LID and RID is low. Even many Authorities Having Jurisdiction (AHJ) are unaware of the differences and are not clear on when a professional is required on a project (as required by the *Architects Act* and the *Alberta Building Code*).

A qualifier of any kind (licensed or registered) can be missed or ignored, leading to projects that require a professional being done by unqualified individuals. This is a concern for public safety.

1.3 Recommendations

The task force is recommending a new title altogether that would more accurately reflect the nature of the scope of work currently done by LIDs: **Interior Architect**.

1.4 Rationale

Currently, the term interior designer is common in public use. However, anyone can use the term (without the qualifier of “licensed”). It covers a wide range of services and can take into account practitioners of widely varying skill levels. There is no requirement for education, experience, ongoing professional development or other oversight by a regulatory body.

However, the term architect is used less extensively, and is more widely recognized as a professional designation. Although there are some common uses of the term accepted other industries (such as software architect) for the most part the term architect is well understood to be a professional in the design and construction industry. This is true with or without the qualifier of “Registered” in front of the name “Architect”.

The definition of scope under current legislation, *Architects Act*, Section 1 (l.1), makes it clear that the scope is “...that **portion of the practice of architecture** that is defined as interior design in the regulations.” Within the General Regulation it is clear that interior design is related only “...to the **interior of the building**.” So, the notion of the title of Interior Architect is a natural evolution from the existing scope definition.

The task force feels that the title of Interior Architect is a much more concise definition of what LIDs currently do and would provide AHJs and the public with a clear and more representative concept that is easier to explain and understand than interior designer with its many iterations currently in use (licensed, registered, professional, residential, commercial, etc.). In an effort to differentiate themselves from interior designers of many stripes, some LIDs already explain to their clients that what they do is essentially “interior architecture.”

This new title would be a fresh start, and would provide an opportunity for proactive communication with multiple stakeholders, including the public, AHJ and major client groups.

Considerations:

- **Change of firm names** – AAA member interior design firms would be required to change their firm names, letterhead and all digital and print marketing materials (at a cost) to reflect the change to the title of Interior Architects.
- **Education of public and AHJ** – This will be a significant change and will require significant support through communication to the public, authorities having jurisdiction, and major client groups. This is a new title that is not yet used in Canada.
- **Dissonance with education system** – There would be a disconnect with the academic institutions in Alberta, at least initially, since currently there are no universities in Alberta or Canada that have interior architecture programs or degrees. However, Mount Royal University is very interested in changing their program from interior design to interior architecture. There are a surprising number of schools (52) in the United States that already have degree programs in interior architecture. Refer to letter from Mount Royal University in the appendix of this document.

Schools of architecture may not be in favor of this approach; however, this has not been fully explored. So far, the University of Calgary is the only institution that has been consulted, and they have indicated

that they would not support this title. However, such a title could create an opportunity for some programs of architecture to develop a variation on their current programming with a focus on interiors, which some might welcome.

- **Illegal practice enforcement** – The work that the AAA does to identify and address instances of illegal practice and unlawful use of protected titles would stay the same or possibly be decreased in relation to this particular scope on account of it being so new. The focus of the enforcement would shift to education of AHJs. Some interior designers that are practicing protected scope would still require attention from AAA, but only for scope, not for title.
- **Labour mobility** – there is a certain amount of pressure for increasing reciprocity across Canada for Registered Interior Designers coming into Alberta. Assessing the qualifications of such RIDs from different provinces and how that relates to the scope of LIDs is problematic. Using a new title of Interior Architect clearly differentiates the scope and changes the conversation around labour mobility significantly.

Alternatives:

- Protect the title of interior designer (all iterations of this title) such that only qualified members of the AAA would be allowed to use this designation.
- There would be a need to resolve the future role of the Interior Designers of Alberta (IDA) Registered Interior Design (RID) members who currently believe they have title protection and the authority to regulate this title. This is not the responsibility of the AAA, however we would work with our colleagues on this issue.
- Protecting the title of interior designer (and all iterations) would be a significant change and would require significant support through communication to the public, authorities having jurisdiction, and major client groups.
- The work that the AAA does to identify and address instances of illegal practice and unlawful use of protected titles will be increased, at least for the first few years. Additional resources will have to be allocated for this purpose.
- There are an unknown number of individuals in Alberta offering “interior design” services. Estimates are more than 600, based on statistics from CIDQ related to the number that have passed NCIDQ exams. Many more may be working in the field without any such achievements. It would be reasonable to expect that many of these people operating businesses or consultant services as “interior designers” would object loudly to having this title prohibited from them. Politically this could be an extremely difficult move for the Ministry of Labour and Immigration to support.

Issue 2 – Scope Definition

2.1 Current Legislation

The definition of the scope of work for licensed interior design currently sits within the General Regulation. There is a simple reference to the practice in the *Architects Act*, but then definition is spelled out in the General Regulation. This is different from how the definition of scope for architecture is treated within the legislation.

The definition is also currently referred to in the negative, as in what the scope is limited to, rather than what it encompasses.

The definition also makes reference to specific exclusions to what is outside of the scope.

Within the *Architects Act*:

Section 1.(1.1)

“Practice of interior design” means that portion of the practice of architecture that is defined as interior design in the regulations;

Within the Architects Act General Regulation:

Definitions:

1. In this Regulation,

(g) “interior design” means that portion of the practice of architecture that is limited to:

(i) planning, designing or giving advice on the design of or on the erection, construction or alteration of or addition to the interior of a building,

(ii) preparing plans, drawings, detail drawings, specifications or graphic representations for the design of or for the erection, construction or alteration of or addition to the interior of a building,

(iii) reviewing work and assessing the performance of work under a contract for the erection, construction or alteration of or addition to the interior of a building, and

(iv) engaging or coordinating architectural and engineering work within the interior of a building,

but does not include engineering work or any work on the exterior shell of a building, environmental separations or exits;

2.2 Issues

The definition of scope should be treated in the same manner as the definition of architecture, with similar wording and in the same location within the legislation. If the scope for Registered Architects is in the Act, the scope for Interior Architects should be in the Act. Alternately, both scope definitions could reside in the General Regulation.

Future legislation should refer to the scope of practice in a positive, rather than negative manner.

There is no clear rationale for providing specific exclusions such as engineering work or work on the exterior shell of a building, environmental separations or exits. Reference is made in the beginning about the interior of the building so referencing the exterior is unnecessary. Also excluding the protected scope of other professions is irrelevant.

2.3 Recommendations

The definition for the scope of practice for interior architecture should be as follows:

Definitions:

“practice of interior **architecture design**” means that portion of the practice of architecture that is: ~~limited to:~~

- (i) Planning, designing or giving advice on the design of or on the erection, construction or alteration of or addition to the interior of a building,
- (ii) Preparing plans, drawings, detail drawings, specifications or graphic representations for the design of or for the erection, construction or alteration of or addition to the interior of a building,
- (iii) Reviewing work and assessing the performance of work under a contract for the erection, construction or alteration of or addition to the interior of a building, and
- (iv) Engaging or coordinating architectural and engineering work within the interior of a building,

~~but does not include engineering work or any work on the exterior shell of a building, environmental separations or exits;~~

2.4 Rationale

- A positive, rather than negative, definition will provide more clarity to the public regarding the scope of the practice of practice of interior architecture.
- The practice of architecture and interior architecture should be treated equally within the legislation
 - to format the definition similar to the formatting of the definition of architecture
 - to locate the definition within the same section of legislation where the definition of the practice of architecture sits (either the Act or the General regulation)
- To eliminate confusion caused by including only a few exclusions rather than an exhaustive list which would not be appropriate here:
 - Engineering work is also excluded from the scope of architecture but is not listed as part of that definition
 - the statement ‘any work on the exterior shell of the building’ is a duplication as each point of the definition specifically states at the end of the sentence that it is regarding ‘the interior of a building’
 - Scope regarding environmental separations and exits is more appropriately clarified within other formats such as Practice Bulletins

Issue 3 – Name of Association

3.1 Current Legislation

The name of the association is established by the legislation. It is not something that we can change without a change in the statute.

3.2 Issue

Currently the name of the Alberta Association of Architects suggest that we are relevant only to architects. If the decision is made to recognize LIDs as Interior Architects, then the current title would continue to be relevant. However, if some variant of interior design is the chosen title for the profession, then there should be a change to the title of the association to reflect the fact that interior designers are one of the professions represented. In this case, a name that is more inclusive of interior design would be appropriate.

The association also needs to think ahead to the inclusion of allied professions that are related to the practice of architecture.

3.3 Recommendations

If “Interior Architect” is chosen, no name change is required. If a name change is desired, the task force is suggesting one of the following names:

- Alberta Association of Architecture and Interior Design
- Alberta Association of Architects and Interior Designers
- Alberta Association of Architectural Professionals
- Alberta Association of Architecture

3.4 Rationale

The chosen name should more fully represent the professions that are regulated. This is clearer for the public. It could also allow for future inclusion of allied professions such as ID technologists, architectural technologists, landscape architects and so on.

Across the country, there is variety in how the regulatory bodies for architecture name themselves, even though none of them currently include interior designers as members:

- AIBC – Architectural Institute of British Columbia
- SAA – Saskatchewan Association of Architects
- NWTAA – Northwest Territories Association of Architects
- MAA – Manitoba Association of Architects
- OAA – Ontario Association of Architects
- OAQ – l’Ordre des architectes du Quebec
- AANB - Architects’ Association of New Brunswick
- NSAA – Nova Scotia Association of Architects
- AAPEI- Architects Association of Prince Edward Island
- ALBNL – Architects Licensing Board of Newfoundland and Labrador

Ontario Association of Architects is working towards bringing interior designers into their membership. It is not clear if they are planning on a name change for the association.

The final decision on a name change would presumably come after the matter of protected title is determined.

Issue 4 – Representation

4.1 Current Legislation

Interior design is referenced in the legislation inconsistently. In some cases, this may be a result of the inclusion of this profession at the last minute, shortly before the legislation went forward for approval and interior designers were missed in the drafting. In other places it may be because specifying interior design representation was not considered important. It’s difficult to say for sure why there is inconsistency.

In general, there are references to the number of members required to participate on committees, council, disciplinary hearing panels, and the practice review board. But the reference to interior designers is inconsistent.

4.2 Issue

Interior designers are full members of the association and it is felt that they should be recognized as equals to architects from the standpoint of representation.

4.3 Recommendations

1. General

Wherever possible, treat representation by members equally. In some cases, it may be easiest to simply refer to “regulated members” or “active members” or some other generic term that applies to both registered architects and interior designers (or interior architects). In the future such a general reference would be inclusive of allied professions.

Where it is not practical to have 50/50 representation of registered architects and interior designers (or interior architects), it is recommended that minimum numbers of interior designers (interior architects) be specified. For example, setting quorum at 50/50 representation for each profession may hamstring the business of the association simply because there are fewer interior design (interior architect) members than registered architects and such quorum requirements may be difficult, if not impossible, to achieve.

Most importantly interior designers (interior architects) must be part of any serious review of the entry to practice, practice review or complaints investigation and hearing process when interior designers (interior architects) and/or their practices are the subject.

2. Council

Current Legislation:

8 **(1)** The Council shall consist of

- a) At least 9 registered architects or a greater number of that may be prescribed by the bylaws, each of whom shall be elected by registered architects and licensed interior designers, at the time, in the manner and for the period provided for by the bylaws, **(a.1) one licensed interior designer** who shall be elected by licensed interior designers and registered architects at the time, in the manner and for the period provided for by the bylaws, and

The extent of public representation is specified by the government and not something for the AAA to influence.

The AAA bylaws were also amended in 2017 to add a second LID to Council as an ex-officio member, which has been positive and productive. At the Council table the input from all members is equally considered, and rarely do issues ever come down to a single vote. However, as the ex-officio member is not eligible to vote, this suggests to the membership that the representation is not equal.

Recommendation

The task force is recommending that there be a minimum number of voting positions specified for interior designers (interior architects). A minimum of two (2) voting positions would be reasonable.

The remaining positions could be filled by members of either type (Registered Architects or Interior Architects).

Rationale

More inclusivity and equality; Council membership should be a representation of the practice of architecture not the individual professions.

Broader representation would allow for diverse viewpoints, experience and expertise.

Greater accountability if all positions are voting positions.

3. Complaints

Current Legislation

Complaint Review Committee

36 There is hereby established a committee called the complaint review committee consisting of not fewer than 3 registered architects and **one licensed interior designer** appointed by the Council in accordance with the regulations to exercise the powers and perform the duties set out in the Part.

Recommendations

The regulation of the practice of interior design (interior architecture) should be represented by an equal number of registered architects and interior designers (interior architects) when it involves the complaint of an interior design (interior architects) member or interior design (interior architecture) firm.

Consider that a minimum of each profession is represented on CRC.

Rationale

Interior designers (interior architects) would have a better combination of knowledge and experience suitable for determining academic qualifications and training requirements necessary for a person to competently engage in the practice of interior design (interior architecture).

More interior designers (interior architects) should be involved when a complaint against an interior designer or interior design firm (interior architects or interior architecture firm) is being reviewed so that it is more inclusive and equal.

4. Practice Review Board

Current Legislation

The wording of the legislation for PRB is very similar to the representation on complaints:

38(1) There is hereby established a board called the Practice Review Board consisting of not fewer than 6 members as follows;

(a) Registered architects who are appointed by the Council,

- (a.1) **at least one licensed interior designer** appointed by the Council,
- (b) Persons who have a combination of knowledge and experience suitable for determining academic qualifications and training requirements necessary for a person to continue to engage in the practice of architecture and who are appointed by the Council,

Recommendation

The regulation of the practice of interior design (interior architecture) should be represented by an equal number of interior designers (interior architects) and architects when it involves the practice review / continuing competency program for interior firms.

Consider that a minimum of each interior designers (interior architects) and architects are on the Practice Review Board.

Rationale

The rationale is the same as for the Complaints Review Committee:

Interiors professionals would have a better combination of knowledge and experience suitable for determining academic qualifications and training requirements necessary for a person to competently engage in the practice of interiors.

More interior designers (interior architects) should be involved when a complaint against these professionals is being reviewed so that it is more inclusive and equal.

Issue 5 – Use of Terms

5.1 Current Legislation

Throughout the legislation there is inconsistency in how the profession of interior design is referenced. In some places is referenced as Licensed Interior Design, and in others just interior design. In other spots, interior design is not referenced where architects and the practice of architecture is noted, and the context is relevant to interior design as well.

5.2 Issue

The issues are inclusiveness, clarity and consistency.

5.3 Recommendations

As noted above in 4.3, wherever possible, treat representation by members equally. In some cases it may be easiest to simply refer to “regulated members” or “active members” or some other generic term that applies to both architects and interior designers (interior architects). In the future such a general reference would be inclusive of allied professions.

An example of inconsistent representation is in the requirements for seals and stamps.

5.4 Rationale

Inclusiveness, clarity and consistency supports the profession of interior design (interior architecture) and reduces confusion both within the professions and with the public.

Consultations

The following outlines the list of stakeholder groups that were consulted. A draft of the five recommendations was presented with an explanation of the rationale behind each recommendation. Each group was invited to provide written feedback following the presentations made. Both the Chair of the Task Force and the Executive Director participated at each meeting.

1. Practice Advisory Committee (PAC)

Natasha presented the draft recommendations. Most of the recommendations were supported. The issue most at debate was protected title. At the first meeting the topic of interior architect was not discussed as it had not been introduced as a title to consider at this point in time. To allow the PAC to provide their comments, a follow up meeting occurred solely focusing on Title Protection.

Outcome: The members of PAC were divided on their support for the protection of Interior Architect versus protection of Interior Designer. While they were generally in agreement that the status quo of the term Licensed Interior Designer is problematic, they were not consistent in how they saw the solution. Enforcement of protected scope was flagged as a critical issue, separate from the matter of protected title.

2. Practice Review Board (PRB)

Natasha presented the draft recommendations for discussion by the PRB. As with other groups, most recommendations were welcomed. The title of interior architect was also introduced, and it generated significant discussion and thoughtful debate.

Outcome: The Practice Review Board outlined pros and cons for the titles of Interior Designer and Interior Architect. They agreed that the title of licensed interior designer does not provide significant distinction from other non-professional interior designers (not licensed with the AAA) throughout the province. They also cautioned that the protection of scope is not likely to occur through the choice of any title alone. After much discussion, the PRB had no clear preference regarding the choice of a new title and deferred a final decision to AAA Council.

3. Interior Design Advisory Committee (IDAC)

This committee reviewed the draft report from the task force and provided their thoughtful feedback.

Outcome: This committee fully embraced the recommendations with the exception of the protected title where they did not come to a firm conclusion. They acknowledged all the complexity of this issue, and even though they are the stakeholders to be most impacted by a title change they could not identify an obvious solution. For the name of the association they were clear that if the title of Interior Designer is chosen, then the name of the AAA should reflect the interior design membership more explicitly.

4. Interior Designers of Alberta (IDA)

Natasha presented the draft recommendations at a special meeting with the leadership of the IDA. The presentation focused to IDA focused on protection of title, since the other matters are relevant more for current AAA members only.

Outcome: IDA expressed a strong desire to work together to develop a solution that would work for all. They felt that protecting the title of Interior Designer is a critical component of moving forward with robust regulation of the interior design profession in Alberta. They did acknowledge however that

if AAA were to be the “owner” of the protected title of Interior Designer that it would have an impact on AAA. The IDA also noted that they were not in favour of the use of the title Interior Architect *at this time* as it would further confuse the public and divide the profession of interior design. They did suggest that flexibility for the future might be desirable.

5. Mount Royal University Interior Design Department (MRU)

Natasha presented the draft recommendations. The discussion with MRU focused specifically on title protection as that was most relevant to the university. The committee wanted to understand if the introduction of the title ‘Interior Architect’ would impact the department and their degree requirements.

Outcome: Mount Royal University was strongly in favour of the use of the title Interior Architect. They noted that there are currently 52 schools in the United States that offer degrees in Interior Architecture. The accreditation body for their program, The Council for Interior Design Accreditation (CIDA), is the accrediting body for professional degree programs in Interior Design and Interior Architecture.

Mount Royal University takes the stance that they educate interior architects. The scope of practice their graduates learn to engage in and the services they learn provide support to the broader practice of architecture. Further they felt that the scope of practice of their graduates is similar to but different from the scope of services of an architect. The university stated that it is their intent to consider the next steps to change the name of their degree to a Bachelor of Interior Architecture.

6. University of Calgary School of Architecture Planning & Landscape (SAPL)

Natasha presented the draft recommendations. The discussion with U of C focused specifically on title protection. The committee wanted to understand if the introduction of the title ‘Interior Architect’ would impact the department and their degree requirements.

Outcome: The School of Architecture, Planning and Landscape (SAPL) does not support the recommendation for the title of Interior Architect. They acknowledged that it might help to clarify the issue that exists with various uses of interior design titles, however they feel that the title of Interior Architect would create other, more substantive and larger concerns and possibly do more harm than good. They noted potential for confusion with the term Architect in the minds of public and potential clients. There could be potential for misunderstandings of how many different types of architects one might need on a project, leading to erosion of the role of the profession in the building industry.

They also felt that clients might think that they need an interior designer in addition to an interior architect. The final point put forward by SAPL was the potential for confusion by potential students interested in a design career who might inadvertently enrol in the wrong program.