

**Royal Institute of British Architects**

**Report of the RIBA Revisiting  
Board to Liverpool John Moores  
University**

Confirmed by the RIBA Education Committee 08 December 2004

**Centre for Architecture  
Liverpool School of Art & Design  
Faculty of Media, Arts & Social Science**

**Part One: BA (Hons) Architecture**

Date of Revisiting Board: 20 August 2004

**NB This report should be read in conjunction with the  
Report of the original Visiting Board: 04-05 March 2004**

## 1. Information About the Courses

### 1.1 Courses offered for revalidation:

Liverpool John Moores University BA (Hons)  
Architecture, Part One, 3 years full-time

### 1.2 Address of the Institution where the courses are delivered

Centre for Architecture  
Liverpool School of Art & Design  
Liverpool John Moores University  
St Nicholas Centre  
Great Orford Street  
Liverpool  
L3 5YD

T: 0151 231 3704  
F: 0151 707 2953  
W: www.livjm.ac.uk

### 1.2 Name of Awarding Body

Liverpool John Moores University

### 1.3 Name of Head of School

Mr Ian Wroot

## 2. Membership of the Visiting Board

2.1 The members of the RIBA Visiting Board for the visit on 20 August 2004

Frank Woods (Chair)  
John Hickey (practitioner)  
Mary Jane Rooney (academic)

All three provided continuity with the previous Board.

Stephanie Beasley-Suffolk (RIBA) was in attendance as Secretary to the Board.

## 3. Procedures & Criteria for the Visit

3.1 The Visiting Board was carried out under the 'RIBA Procedures for the Validation of UK Courses and Examinations in Architecture,' published July 2003, effective from September 2003, and 'Tomorrow's Architect,' published March 2003, effective from September 2003.

## 4. Recommendations of the Visiting Board Confirmed by the Royal Institute of British Architects Education Committee 08 December 2004

4.1 The RIBA Education Committee at its meeting on 08 December 2004 confirmed **Continued Validation** of;

Liverpool John Moores University BA (Hons)  
Architecture, Part One, 3 years full-time

4.2 The next Visiting Board should take place in 2008.

## 5. Recommendation of the Visiting Board to the Commonwealth Association of Architects and the Construction Industry Council & EU Directive

5.1 The Visiting Board was satisfied that the Part One course met the Construction Industry Council Common Learning Outcomes for Degree Courses in the Built Environment

5.2 Given the changes to the Part 2 course, the Visiting Board recommends to ARB that the Part 1 and Part 2 courses together met all points of the EU Directive.

## 6. Criteria for Validation

6.1 On the basis of the sample of academic portfolios examined, the Visiting Board was satisfied that all the students graduating from the courses and examinations listed in 4.1 above satisfied all the Criteria for Validation (which are held in common by the RIBA for validation and the ARB for prescription).

## 7. Standards

7.1 On the basis of the sample of academic portfolios examined, the work from previous year of the course listed in 4.1 was inspected during the visit and was found to meet the required standards.

## 8. Conditions of Validation

8.1 There were no conditions attached to the courses listed in 4.1.

## 9. Standard Requirements of Recognition

9.1 RIBA recognition of all courses/qualifications is dependent upon:

- i. external examiners being appointed for the course;
- ii. any significant changes to the courses and examinations being submitted to the RIBA;
- iii. any change of award title, and the effective date of the change, being reported to the RIBA so that, where appropriate, recognition may formally be transferred to the new title by the RIBA;
- iv. submission to the RIBA of the names of students passing the courses/qualifications listed in 4.

## 10. Summary of the Recommendations, Advice & Commentary Contained in the Full Report

10.1 This was a one-day, focussed revisit, as outlined in the conditions applied to the Part One Course by the Visiting Board of March 2004. It should be noted that it was not expected that compliance with the 'Recommendations' noted in the Report of March 2004 would be reviewed at this point. Action taken on recommendations is tracked in annual monitoring returns, the mid-term review and the subsequent full Visiting Board.

10.2 The School's strengths include:  
Please refer to the Visiting Board Report of 04-05 March 2004.

10.3 Recommendations  
The Visiting Board has made the following recommendations. The RIBA will expect the Institution to report on action taken or planned as a result of the

---

recommendations in the annual monitoring returns submitted by the school and in the mid term review. Failure by an Institution to act on recommendations may result in a course being conditioned by a future Visiting Board.

encourage students to make wider use of media to enrich their design processes and to encourage critical self awareness and this could involve a wider use of sketch notebooks, models photography and film.

- 10.3.1 Students should be encouraged to demonstrate their design intentions, development approaches and design resolutions in a meaningful and reflective way, and illustrate adequately how the building's performance criteria and objectives are responded to within the development of design and technology in the portfolio.
- 10.3.2 The Board redesignates the following statement, originally offered as 'Advice' in the report of March 2004, as a Recommendation. The Board recommends that the Centre provide its students with greater guidance on the assembly and maintenance of academic portfolios with a view to ensuring that the portfolio is a coherent, complete and well structured assembly of information capable of independent consideration. In particular, emphasis should be placed on developmental materials being retained and incorporated in the portfolios and photographic records of physical models included.
- 10.4 Advice  
The Visiting Board offers the following advice to the Institution on desirable, but not essential improvements, which it is felt would assist course development and/or raise standards:
- 10.4.1 The Board believes that the design portfolio could benefit from using a wider palette of media to represent and communicate more clearly design intentions, design processes and design resolution. The school could