

Royal Institute of British Architects

**Report of the RIBA Visiting Board
to the RIBA Examination in
Architecture for Office-Based
Candidates**

**Confirmed following RIBA Education
Committee 29 November 2006**

Royal Institute of British Architects

Managed by the Department of Architecture, Oxford Brookes
University

The RIBA Part One Certificate in Architecture, Part One
The RIBA Part Two Diploma in Architecture, Part Two

Date of Visiting Board: 06-07 July 2006

1. Information About the Examinations

- 1.1 **Examinations offered for revalidation:**
The RIBA Part One Certificate in Architecture
The RIBA Part Two Diploma in Architecture

- 1.2 **Address of the Institution**
Royal Institute of British Architects
66 Portland Place
London
W1B 1AD
T: 0207 307 3625
F: 0207 307 3754

Franchised to:
Department of Architecture,
Oxford Brookes University
Gipsy Lane
Oxford OX3 0BP
T: 01865 483200
F: 01865 483298

- 1.3 **Name of Awarding Body**
Royal Institute of British Architects
- 1.4 **Name of Head of Institution**
Professor Mark Swenarton, Head of Department of
Architecture, Oxford Brookes University
Simon Allford, Vice-President (Education) RIBA

2. Membership of the Visiting Board

- 2.1 The members of the RIBA Visiting Board for the visit on
6/7 July 2007 were:

Robert Hutson (Chair)
Kate Heron (Vice-Chair)
David Howarth
Richard Patterson
Pavandeep Panesar (Graduate/Student Member)

The Office-Based Examination is a national initiative and therefore RIBA regional representation was not necessary.

The Board was one member short as no non-architect members were available. The Board continued as planned with the consent of Examination management team and the Chair of the Validation Committee. The Board remained quorate throughout.

Stephanie Beasley-Suffolk (Acting Head of Validation, RIBA) was in attendance as Secretary to the Board.

Mr David Hodges, Quality Assurance Officer, Oxford Brookes University Academic Policy and Quality Unit, acted as Institutional Facilitator during the visit.

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. For more information see www.architecture.com.

4. Recommendations of the Visiting Board Confirmed by the Royal Institute of British Architects Education Committee following its meeting on 29 November 2006

4.1 Following its meeting on 29 November 2006, the RIBA Education Committee confirmed:

Continued Validation of:

The RIBA Part One Certificate in Architecture
The RIBA Part Two Diploma in Architecture

4.2 The next Visiting Board should take place in 2010.

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

5.1 The Visiting Board recommends to the Commonwealth Association of Architects that the CAA continue with their accreditation of the Part Two qualification.

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

5.3 The Visiting Board confirms to ARB that the Part One & Two examinations 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 candidates graduating from the 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). It should be noted that Oxford Brookes University administers, sets and quality assures the Examination on behalf of the RIBA. There is no formal taught element attached to the RIBA Office-Based Examination although it does require candidates to appoint their own tutors and office mentors.

7. Standards

7.1 On the basis of the sample of academic portfolios examined, the work from previous year of the examination submissions 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 qualifications 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 examinations;

- ii. any significant changes to the 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 candidates passing the qualifications listed in 4.1.

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

10.1 Background

10.1.1 The RIBA Office-Based Examination is unique in the UK. Although it is an examination, it extends beyond this in that it also offers a programme of tutoring and development, to help candidates be ready for the examination. However, it is not a formal taught course or a conventional programme, such as those to be found in Schools of Architecture in Higher Education institutions. It is intended to provide a framework for study, assessment, personal achievement and professional development in accordance with the RIBA Outline Syllabus at Part One and Part Two for individuals who are employed in architectural education. Individuals enrolled on the Examinations route are not students, but candidates. Although the Examinations remain under the ownership of the RIBA, Oxford Brookes University administers, sets and quality assures the Examination under franchise on behalf of the RIBA.

10.1.2 The “Guide, Syllabus and Regulations” for the Examination provides candidates with details of how to

appoint a tutor. Tutors are appointed and paid by the candidate. He or she must be an EU registered architect with at least three years’ qualified experience and not retired for longer than 5 years. The tutor has a specific role in preparing the candidate for the examination, which is outlined in the Regulations. Tutors cannot be connected with the candidate’s office.

Successful candidates must also identify an Office Mentor within his or her practice, whose responsibility is to ensure that the candidate is given an appropriate range of work, allowed the time to do it, monitor progress and oversee the candidate’s Professional Experience Diary. Mentors make sure that the candidate is properly supported in the practice to give them the time to do the work.

10.1.3 The Board considered that the RIBA Office-Based Examinations were an excellent and necessary initiative as they provide a crucial alternative, but no less challenging, route of entry to the profession. The Board applauds the commitment to the programme by the RIBA, Oxford Brookes University and all those involved in the support and guidance of candidates. It particularly commends the spirit of the tutors and mentors. The level of commitment is very impressive and there seems to be a great esprit de corps.

10.1.4 The Board believes that the Examinations hold great potential, particularly given the present discussion around the future content and structure of UK architectural education. The Board noted the improvement in quality of the candidates’ entry qualifications and the broadening appeal of the examination. Already good and improving, the Examinations need to evolve and adapt to continue to serve the needs of candidates. In addition, a very positive

iterative cycle results from the candidates' enrolment in the examination, in that they take their enthusiasm back to the offices with them.

10.1.4 On consideration, the Visiting Board believes that what is presently on offer is a hybrid of a course and an examination. The Board acknowledges the substantial efforts made by Oxford Brookes University since they took over the franchise to introduce new examiners with substantial current academic experience to work alongside three of the original six RIBA examiners providing continuity, but believes that this process needs to continue. Although it understands that reviews are carefully planned and structured well in advance, the Board believes that attention needs to be directed towards their actual operation as those observed by the Board appear somewhat ad hoc.

10.2 Recommendations

10.2.1 The Visiting Board has made the following recommendations. The RIBA expects the Examination management team to report on action taken or planned as a result of the recommendations in the annual monitoring returns submitted and in the mid term review. Failure to act on recommendations may result in a course being conditioned by a future Visiting Board.

10.2.2 Whilst the Board was confident that design outcomes demonstrated conformity with the criteria, the Board felt that there was a lack of specific evidence of the design process. The Board recommends that the Examination management team looks specifically at:

- i. those elements of the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Design that require candidates to demonstrate:
 - "an understanding of an appropriate philosophical approach which reveals an understanding of theory in a cultural context"
 - "the ability to generate and systematically test, analyse and appraise design options, and draw conclusions which display methodological and theoretical rigour."

and

- ii. those elements of the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Cultural Context that require candidates to demonstrate the ability to:
 - "critically appraise and form considered judgements about the spatial, aesthetic, technical and social qualities of a design within the scope and scale of a wider environment."
 - "independently define, and critically appraise, their ideas in relation to a design and to the work of others."

10.2.3 The Board recommends that briefs are cross-referenced more adequately to the syllabus. The Board found that currently briefs are not structured in such a way that they both challenge the most able candidates whilst providing a secure working framework for the weaker students. They have not been adequately evaluated in terms of complexity according to the level of the examination.

10.2.4 The Board recommends that briefs should encompass the task of design, the objective of design and how it might be evident in the final results.

10.2.5 Whilst acknowledging Oxford Brookes University's achievements since taking on the examination, the Board recommends that briefs and specific assignments be amplified to include guidance for tutors.

10.2.6 The Board notes the recommendation of the 2002 Visiting Board that the appointment of personal tutors be formalised. The Board acknowledges that this was addressed in 2003 and that measures taken were deemed satisfactory by the RIBA and the ARB. However, the present Board recommends that this be further enhanced as tutors are still uncertain of their precise role in supporting candidates. The Board recommends that the Examination Management continue to investigate ways of keeping tutors better informed to serve the needs of candidates and the aims of the examinations. The anticipated growth of the course will make this more important. Even though the current remit makes no provision for formal teaching, this may have to be addressed as the Examination grows.

10.3 Advice

The Board offered no additional advice.

11. Summary of Previous Visiting Board Reports

11.1 The last RIBA/ARB Visiting Board to the RIBA Office-Based Examinations took place on 18/19 April 2002.

The Visiting Board recommended Continued Validation of:

Part Three: RIBA Examination in Professional Practice

Conditional Continued Validation of

Part One: RIBA Examination in Architecture at Part One

Part Two: RIBA Examination in Architecture at Part Two

11.2 Summary of the 2002 Visiting Board report.

“The Institute’s strengths included a highly committed and supportive staff and a bright, confident candidate body. The Board found that the Examinations’ structure had a great many strengths and provided a valuable route for studying architecture. The Board recommended that the impending franchise partnership with Oxford Brookes University could develop the Examinations even further.

“The Board found that the RIBA Examination in Architecture (Part One) met the Criteria for Validation at Part One level. The Board found that the lowest pass standards were adequate. However, it recommended that the standard should not be permitted to fall below the level observed by the Board at the time of the visit. The Board found evidence in the higher pass portfolios, that the Examinations provided candidates with a competent and sound experience in architectural design at this level. The Board found evidence in the higher pass portfolios that the non-design elements were demonstrated in the design output to a high standard. However, at the lower pass levels, the Board recommended that the integration of the non-design elements, although adequate, could be improved in the area of historical context and architectural theory. The Board noted that the Professional Studies

and Management element as demonstrated in the portfolios was a strength of the Examination.

“The Board found that the RIBA Examination in Architecture (Part Two) met the Criteria for Validation and the standards of the design work at the lowest pass level were competent. The Board noted that despite this, there was little excitement or vibrancy in the design work at this level. The Board recommended that the RIBA may wish to explore ways of encouraging its candidates to be more experimental in their approach to design. The Board was pleased to find that candidates demonstrated a thorough awareness of construction and technology in their design work.

“The Board was satisfied that the standard achieved in the Examination in Professional Practice (Part Three) was appropriate. The Board learned that Part Three was also undertaken as a self-directed programme. The Board was pleased to learn that the Part Three Examination was well organised and managed. The Board found that the lowest pass standards were appropriate.

“Despite being satisfied that the lowest pass portfolios were satisfactory and that the Criteria for Validation were being achieved at Parts One, Two and Three, the Board had concerns regarding some of the quality assurance practices which supported the examination framework. The Board recognised that the staff and relevant committees were aware of these issues and were seeking to address them, but recommended that further work must be carried out to ensure that these mechanisms are developed and adopted.”

The 2002 Visit was carried out under the former joint RIBA/Architects’ Registration Board procedures. Following extensive correspondence and meetings between the RIBA, Oxford Brookes University and the ARB, it was agreed that a revisit would not be necessary and would not yield further relevant information. Oxford Brookes submitted documentation for ARB’s consideration in April 2004. RIBA and Oxford Brookes attended the ARB Prescription Committee on 17 May 2004. An oral report was presented to the ARB Board on 8 July 2004. The ARB Board was satisfied that progress had been made and the conditions duly discharged.

12. Details of the Conditions in Item 8.

12.1 There were no conditions attached to the examinations listed in 4.1.

13. Commentary

13.1 **Self-Appraisal and Developments since the last visit**
The Board considered that the Critical Self-Appraisal was entirely satisfactory. It was thorough and honest, relating in detail the history of the examinations and how steps had been taken, through the franchise agreement, to tackle its previous weaknesses and give it and the candidates the support and robust quality assurance it deserves.

The RIBA has always offered an external candidate route to qualification and this was established as the RIBA Examination for Office-Based Candidates in 1988. It is recognised as a ‘listed qualification’ under the EU Architects Directive and also as a ‘social betterment’ route to qualification under the EU Social Directive.

In the late 1990s, when the Office-Based Examination system was experiencing problems, the RIBA debated whether it should continue to exist. The RIBA ultimately decided that it was very important to retain the Office-Based route but that this could only be done with support from an established and experienced institution. In order to retain its credibility, survive and develop, it needed to be supported by an academic institution with established quality assurance frameworks. The Examinations were subsequently franchised to Oxford Brookes University in October 2002. The franchise is due for renewal in 2012, with a review at the half-way point in 2007.

In 2005 the Part One and Part Two award names were changed to Part 1: The RIBA Part One Certificate in Architecture and Part 2: the RIBA Part 2 Diploma in Architecture.

In 2005 the period in practice entry requirement for Part One was reduced from six years to three years. The intention is to maintain a good balance between providing greater access to the programme in response to candidate demand, whilst maintaining the unique quality of the programme.

The RIBA Part Three examination has been franchised to the RIBA North West Region since 2004. This is now subject to separate validation and prescription and was not considered by the present Board.

13.1.1 **Operation of the franchise**

The RIBA 'owns' the examination but the day to day running is overseen by the Programme Management Committee and Programme Examination Committee, comprising members of staff at Oxford Brookes

University and members of RIBA Examinations Committee. Both Committees report to the RIBA Examinations Committee. Quality Assurance is managed by Oxford Brookes University. Both parties believe that the strength of the process lies in the arm's length relationship between the RIBA and OBU.

The Examination management believes that the whole operation of the examination has become more professional since the franchise arrangement was made. The number of candidates has doubled and the formalisation of procedures has raised the level of achievement. The management also believes it is now a much more open process.

The franchise is due for renewal in 2012 and a major review is planned for 2007. This will enable changes in the present arrangements to be made if appropriate. The review will consider the implications for the Office-Based Examination of the Vice President (Education)'s initiative. It will also discuss the possibility of offering an Oxford Brookes' award.

13.1.2 **Future development of the Examination**

The RIBA and Oxford Brookes University believe that the Office-Based Examination will assume ever more importance and relevance in the evolving context of architectural education, as changing fee regimes may make it more difficult for students to pursue a long, full time academic career. The profession as a whole is looking at more flexible ways to educate potential architects including a greater focus on training practices. The RIBA believes that the Office-Based Examination has now developed beyond its original Social Betterment function

and that it will form an integral part of this alternative route.

The recognition of the office-based route to qualification is seen as a return to the roots of the profession. However, appropriate sized cohorts will be necessary to afford candidates an appropriately resourced experience. Any growth needs to be managed carefully.

13.2 Documentation and Arrangements for the Visit

RIBA Visiting Boards always seek to be objective exercises, and procedures are in place to ensure there is no conflict of interest between members of the Board and the institution being visited.

Because with this visit the RIBA was subjecting its own examinations to scrutiny, additional steps were taken to assure the integrity of the process. Clear lines of demarcation were drawn between RIBA Education staff and RIBA Senior Management who were involved with the preparation for and conduct of the Board, drafting and approval of the report on behalf of RIBA Validation Committee and those involved as representatives of the RIBA's ownership of the Examinations working with the team from Oxford Brookes University. No RIBA staff were involved on both sides of the visit. The RIBA can thus demonstrate that this process was as dispassionate and rigorous as that undergone by schools of architecture.

The Board would like to thank Oxford Brookes University for hosting the Visiting Board. All practical arrangements were excellent. The examination documentation was forwarded to the RIBA Visiting Board in a timely manner. The documentation as a whole was good and the mapping

of the examinations against the RIBA criteria was adequate. The portfolios were well laid out and clearly labelled. During the visit staff were very helpful and willing to obtain additional information when needed.

The standard RIBA Visiting Board timetable was customised to accommodate the unique operation of the Office-Based Examination. The visit was timed to coincide with Portfolio Development workshop and interim crits to allow the Board to observe these and also to meet a wide range of candidates, mentors, tutors and examiners. There was no exhibition as such, as this was not appropriate to the circumstances, but work was pinned up as exemplars and for the interim crit session. The RIBA Visiting Board also met senior management of the RIBA and Oxford Brookes University as well as the staff of Oxford Brookes University who are responsible for the day to day administration of the examinations. This series of meetings was extremely helpful in enabling the Visiting Board to understand the details of the franchise agreement, structure and conduct of the Examination itself and the two institutions' ambitions for the future development of the Examination.

13.2.1 *Record of Academic Portfolios sampled during the visit*

The Board considered the following candidates' portfolios:

- a. **Part One**
 - 3 lowest passes
 - 2 middle passes
 - 2 high passes
 - Total: 7 portfolios (from 7 candidates)
- b. **Part Two**
 - 3 lowest passes

2 middle passes
2 high passes.
Total: 7 portfolios (from 8 candidates)

All marks sheets were provided.

13.3 Responses made to the previous Visiting Board report (and to reports of any revisits) and external examiner comments.

The Board acknowledges the programme is still developing and that it has taken the Examination Management the full four years since the last visiting board to the Examinations to reach its present stage. The Examination management team has made every effort to respond to the conditions and recommendations of the 2002 Visiting Board. The main concerns were focussed in two areas; firstly, the formalisation of the appointment of personal tutors, including guidance for tutors in their role, monitoring and feedback mechanism for tutors and candidates and a database of tutors for prospective candidates. The 2006 Visiting Board found that appropriate mechanisms had now been put in place to deal with these issues as far as possible. There is a database of tutors, but this cannot be made openly accessible due to data protection legislation. Tutors may give permission for their details to be given to a third party.

The 2002 Board was also concerned that an External Examiner had not been appointed for all parts of the Examinations, only for the design elements. Following the Board the RIBA appointed an External Examiner with responsibility for the whole programme. There are now two External Examiners attached to the examinations and

their procedures are identical to those of Oxford Brookes University.

The 2002 Board also recommended that formal candidate feedback and monitoring arrangements should be introduced. This resulted in the introduction of a candidate questionnaire which is issued annually. The responses are considered by the Programme Management Committee and the RIBA Examinations Committee.

However there are still some concerns in those general areas. At their meeting with the External Examiners, the External said that all candidates had reached an appropriate standard but the strengths and weaknesses displayed are qualitatively different from students on conventional courses.

13.4 Detailed commentary on the Examinations

All details of the Part One and Part Two examinations are laid out in the ‘Syllabus, Guide and Regulations for the RIBA Examinations in Architecture for Office-Based Candidates’ (March 2003) recently superseded by the ‘Guide, Syllabus and Regulations’ issued January 2006. The work seen by the present Board was conducted under the 2003 Regulations.

13.5 Examination structure

This is not an examination in the traditional sense, but a modern examination with formative stages which the Examination management believes gives candidates some form of security.

The examination year runs from March to February. The Examinations are divided into four Phases. The RIBA/ARB Part One criteria are covered by Phase One

and Phase Two, and Part Two is covered by Phase Three and Phase Four. For Part One, each phase takes a minimum of two years to complete and a maximum of four. For Part Two, each phase takes a minimum of one year and a maximum of three. What must be achieved in each phase of the programme is clearly outlined in the 'Guide'. Candidates must pass each stage of a phase, and may not progress to Phase Two if they have not passed Phase One.

Phase One is preparatory and candidates must pass the written examinations and the design element. In Phase Two, candidates may also choose electives. In addition to formative portfolio reviews, candidates also complete written assignments in supporting subjects, the knowledge and skills gained from which must then be brought together into the Comprehensive Design Project in the fourth year which is the culmination of Part One.

If successful at all stages, a candidate can achieve Part One after a minimum of four years. The maximum time allowed is eight years, but to date no candidate has needed this amount of time.

The maximum period a candidate may be enrolled on the programme without presenting for examination is five years.

Part Two comprises Phase Three and Phase Four. The structure is more flexible than at Part One, as candidates may choose to submit their case study or dissertation in Phase Three or Phase Four. As with Part One, the culmination of Part Two is the Comprehensive Design Project.

Candidates must allow 10 days maximum per year in order to attend the Induction Day, the written examinations in April and May, the portfolio development workshops in June/July, portfolio reviews, interim and final assessments.

13.6 Detailed Commentary on the Part One Qualification

13.6.1 Quality and coverage of the syllabus (including balance and integration between design/non-design work)

The Board believed that the syllabus and examination were entirely appropriate and clearly designed to meet the criteria.

- *Design*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part One Validation Criteria in the area of Design were being met by all graduates from the RIBA Part One Office-Based Examination.

As there is no course (and therefore no credit system on which to draw) it is difficult to establish from the documentation whether the RIBA requirement that at least 50% be devoted to design is achieved. However, the examination requires a fully-integrated, comprehensive design project at both Part One and Part Two. In addition candidates must pass all parts of the examination. This satisfied the Board that this requirement had been met.

The Board noted that candidates are encouraged to bring evidence of process (sketches, models and so forth) to the examination. There was a lot of focus on process at the interim crit.

The Board believes that the demands of the examination need to be raised because it considers that candidates are not being sufficiently stretched by the examination and their potential is not being fulfilled. The Examination management acknowledges that presentation and areas of technology tend to be stronger whereas design, as an intellectual, rigorously pursued activity tends to be weaker (this is true at Part Two as well as at Part One).

- *Technology & Environment*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part One Validation Criteria in the area of Technology and Environment were being met by all graduates from the RIBA Part One Office-Based Examination.

Candidates acquire an adequate level of knowledge from their work in offices. The Board believes that there are opportunities for this to be pushed further. At present coverage of this area of the criteria is good, but it was considered that this could be further improved since candidates are starting from a higher base, being already engaged in architectural practice.

- *Cultural Context*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part One Validation Criteria in the area of Cultural Context were being met by all graduates from the RIBA Part One Office-Based Examination.

This is introduced early in Part One and is adequately covered, chiefly by means of an extended essay. The Board believed that integration of cultural context studies with design, although adequate, could be better.

- *Communication*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part One Validation Criteria in the area of Communication were being met by all graduates from the RIBA Part One Office-Based Examination.

Given the constraints of travelling, there was a reasonable number of models on display for the Board. Drawings were of a high quality. The candidates' skills of presentation could be further developed as at present they are relying on representational techniques developed in office environments. Candidates could be encouraged to look at more experimental forms of representation. In their meeting with the Board, one candidate expressed the desire to be required to do things he did not normally do in the office which would allow skills in this area to be developed.

- *Management Practice & Law*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part One Validation Criteria in the area of Management, Practice and Law were being met by all graduates from the RIBA Part One Office-Based Examination.

Candidates must keep a Professional Experience Diary throughout their period of study. Management Practice and ILw is formally assessed at Part One level through two pieces of coursework: P1 "Elective essay and problem scenario" and P2 "Project related study for the Part One design project". The Board considered that coverage of this area of the criteria was good and that candidates clearly benefit from being in practice.

Candidates are probably more used to process as they are in practice but it is necessary to impress on them that they must be aware of the bigger picture. Despite being in practice, examiners have found that levels of achievement can vary, with language often being a factor.

13.7 Detailed Commentary on the Part Two qualification

13.7.1 Quality and coverage of the syllabus (including balance and integration between design/non-design work)

The Board believed that the scope of the Examination was entirely appropriate and clearly designed to meet the criteria.

- *Design*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Design were being met by all graduates from the RIBA Part Two Office-Based Examination.

However there is evidence that the candidates are not being sufficiently stretched. The Board queried the appropriateness of some of the briefs. Some have been inherited from the previous administration as some candidates have been participating in the programme a long time.

The Board believes that the briefs need to be refreshed in order to enhance aspirations and to inspire and challenge the Part Two candidates.

Whilst the Board was confident that design outcomes demonstrated conformity with the criteria, the Board felt that there was a lack of specific evidence of the design process. The Board recommends that the Examination management team looks specifically at those elements of the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Design that require candidates to demonstrate:

- "an understanding of an appropriate philosophical approach which reveals an understanding of theory in a cultural context"
- "the ability to generate and systematically test, analyse and appraise design options, and draw conclusions which display methodological and theoretical rigour."

The Board concurred with the External Examiners' opinions that, although lowest pass standards have been correctly established in relation to the criteria, at present much of the candidates' work is towards the lower end of the normal marking range.

On the basis of their observations and discussions during the visit, the Board considered that the debate/culture underpinning the portfolio reviews might be more informative, enthusiastic and challenging.

- *Technology & Environment*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Technology and Environment were being met by all graduates from the RIBA Part Two Office-Based Examination.

The Board considered that coverage of these criteria was adequate and showed appropriate connections with office

practice. However, the Board would have welcomed more evidence of sustainability issues.

- *Cultural Context*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Cultural Context were being met by all graduates from the RIBA Part Two Office-Based Examination.

Whilst the Board was confident that design outcomes demonstrated conformity with the criteria, the Board felt that there was a lack of specific evidence of the design process. The Board recommends that the Examination management team looks specifically at those elements of the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Cultural Context that require candidates to demonstrate the ability to:

- "critically appraise and form considered judgements about the spatial, aesthetic, technical and social qualities of a design within the scope and scale of a wider environment."
- "independently define, and critically appraise, their ideas in relation to a design and to the work of others."

- *Communication*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Communication were being met by all graduates from the RIBA Part Two Office-Based Examination.

The Board considered that coverage of this area was adequate and appropriate to the situation. They were

concerned, however, about the level of sophistication of some of the work. Some models and photographs of models tended to be of perfunctory ambition and lacking in aspiration. The Board believed that the candidates' scope may have been limited to the habitual use of representational techniques they had encountered in practice.

- *Management Practice & Law*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Management, Practice and Law were being met by all graduates from the RIBA Part Two Examination.

This is covered in the Professional Experience Diary described in paragraph 13.6.1.

13.8 Progression (Part One and Part Two)

Progression towards examination is driven by the individual student. This allows them to develop at their own pace, which the Board considered to be a strength of the programme. Candidates may also suspend their studies for up to five years if appropriate. It was noted that Oxford Brookes University and the RIBA have relatively little control of progression, as it is determined by the candidate's unique personal circumstances and needs.

However, candidates must sign an annual learning contract which covers all phases of the programme. It is not possible to omit a phase. The annual learning contract has been introduced as a way of bringing some element of control to progression rates and to motivate candidates to complete the Examination.

13.9 Assessment: methods, content and coverage, relative weightings, standards achieved (Part One and Part Two).

The Board found the assessment regime to be adequately rigorous. All regulations are clear and unambiguous and candidates appear to understand the system well. The Board was particularly impressed that the examinations were marked during the day that candidates attend the University for assessment. If a candidate does not present for a design review or examination, having signed the learning contract, a mark of zero is recorded. Candidates have a month after its initial negotiation during which they can change their contract.

The pass mark is 50%. Candidates are given feedback immediately as they have often travelled long distances to attend. If candidates are given less than 40% they are given individual feedback. Candidates also receive a formal letter notifying them of the outcome and tutors also receive feedback. Presentation of work and achievement of the various phases is time limited. Relatively few models are presented as it is difficult to transport them safely.

Candidates are assessed by a combination of methods appropriate to the areas of study: written examinations, written and verbal assessments, submissions of papers, essays, studies and dissertations, portfolio reviews and design assessments.

Because work is not undertaken under the supervision of the examiners, establishing the authenticity and authorship of work is viewed as being very important. There are rules that candidates must follow and examiners look at the preliminary designs to help them establish authorship.

Candidates are also required to bring sketchbooks to the examination in addition to the finished work. The examiners are confident that this system identifies any work that was not the candidate's. Authenticity is also established through questioning and observation of the design process and the tutors' reports. In preparation for the major portfolio reviews, tutors meet their candidates several times over many months and their familiarity with the work and its development is crucial.

Examiners have found it is necessary to be careful about work from stronger practices as this can have an influence on a candidate's work. Portfolio Reviews are undertaken by single examiners but Design Assessments are undertaken by groups of two or three examiners, to ensure parity. The Board noted that tutors are invited in writing to observe crits.

The Board was particularly interested in the project briefs issued to tutors and candidates. A range of briefs is supplied for the comprehensive design projects at both Part One and Part Two levels. This is to allow candidates, with the guidance of their tutors, to select and refine a brief that allows them to engage in design issues of particular interest to them. Candidates also select their own site. The Board learned that learning outcomes are written specifically for each brief, in addition to which candidates and tutors refer constantly to the Guide Syllabus. Briefs are retained for a relatively long time as candidates stay in the system longer than in a formal academic programme. Change cannot be too radical as candidates need continuity; however, Oxford Brookes believes that briefs are now beginning to offer candidates an appropriately challenging vehicle through which to develop their skills beyond the pragmatic. The

examination is intended to stretch candidates beyond what they are doing in practice. Briefs are more geographically diverse and are not on a fixed site, to allow candidates flexibility. Oxford Brookes seeks constantly to develop the programme; but this cannot be rushed, given the candidates' need for continuity.

Briefs and issues around them are reviewed as part of the annual review process. The Examination management team introduces a new brief every year. Candidates have a choice of three.

The Board recommends that briefs are cross-referenced more adequately to the syllabus. The Board found that currently briefs are not structured in such a way that they both challenge the most able candidates whilst providing a secure working framework for the weaker students. They have not been adequately evaluated in terms of complexity according to the level of the examination.

The Board recommends that briefs should encompass the task of design, the objective of design and how it might be evident in the final results.

Whilst acknowledging Oxford Brookes University's achievements since taking on the examination, the Board recommends that briefs and specific assignments be amplified to include guidance for tutors.

The Board was very impressed with the administration of the course and the level of support offered by the Oxford Brookes staff who are permanently attached to it. Although it understands that reviews are carefully planned and structured well in advance, the Board believes that attention needs to be directed towards their actual

operation and that they could have been more challenging; those observed by the Board appeared somewhat ad hoc. The enthusiasm, application and dedication of the candidates is remarkable and the Board believes this should be matched by those conducting the crits. The Board encourages the franchise holders to consider staff development with the aim of improving the experience of the reviews for the candidates.

13.10 Appeals

When the franchise arrangement was set up it was agreed that the RIBA as owners of the Examination, should deal with complaints and appeals. This is made clear to candidates. Both parties agree that this has worked successfully to date.

13.11 Admissions and arrangements for direct entry at later stages

At present, between 30 and 40 people apply each year. There is a stringent, two stage admissions process which attempts to identify which candidates will benefit from this particular route. The administration takes great care to point out that it is a demanding pathway and not suited to everyone.

Sometimes exemplar portfolios are shown to aspiring candidates and they are all invited to end of year shows. Prospective candidates apply to the programme in August. Candidates must have spent a minimum of three years in practice. This requirement has recently been reduced from six years. They must remain in architectural practice for the duration of the programme under the direct supervision of a registered architect.

If prospective candidates are not accepted immediately they may be advised to undertake more study and reapply at a later date. They may also be asked to undertake additional preparatory work.

If appropriate, prospective candidates are invited for a formal interview in September, October or November which gives them sufficient time to prepare for the first exams in April and May and to produce the first piece of written work. An Induction Day is then held in January, to which all candidates and their tutors are invited (candidates are expected to have found a tutor by this time). At this point candidates must submit the first piece of work; Part One candidates are required to submit a book review and Part Two candidates must submit a Building Study. These first pieces of work are not marked but intended to be a re-introduction to starting to read and write analytically in an academic setting.

Applicants are assessed by an Interviewer drawn from the Examiners on the programme. Prospective candidates must be employed in an architect's office and satisfy some basic academic requirements. They must also present a portfolio, a letter of support from their present employer and a personal statement in support of their application and their reasons for choosing this route. If chosen, applicants must also send their Personal Tutor's CV to Oxford Brookes University. There is some scope for the accreditation of prior experiential learning (APEL) at Part One, but only on the recommendation of the Subject Examiner. Graduates from professionally validated construction industry degrees may enter Part One no later than the end of the first year. No exemptions are offered at Part Two. APEL procedures are managed by Oxford

Brookes University which has considerable experience of this.

The course attracts some well-qualified candidates, particularly at Part Two with an increasing numbers of applicants having achieved First Class and 2.1 degree. The qualifications of Part One entrants are also on an upward trend, with candidates applying from a variety of interesting backgrounds.

Interviewers investigate the candidates' design ambition and would expect to see work addition to that undertaken by the candidates as part of their paid employment. The Examination management has sometimes advised candidates that they may need to change practice if they are to have a better chance of being given appropriate work.

13.12 External examining arrangements

Two External Examiners are now attached to the process; one to the Part One Examination and one to the Part Two. Previously one External had been responsible for both Part One and Part Two; this Examiner's term of office expired in 2005. The Board was pleased to meet this Examiner in person and was able to hold a videoconference with the present Part One External Examiner. The current Part Two External Examiner was not able to be present but his reports were available to the Board.

It is evident that External Examining arrangements have been tightened up considerably since the last Visiting Board. They are appointed according to Oxford Brookes University's standard quality assurance procedures managed by OBU's Academic Policy and Quality Unit

(APQU). The APQU is responsible for ensuring that the examinations are conducted properly. External Examiners' procedures follow exactly those of OBU which conform to the QAA's precepts.

Externals interview each candidate in front of their design work and portfolio of related assignments. Specific reference is now made to the jointly held RIBA/ARB criteria in the Examiners' report template and they are required to confirm that all candidates have satisfied all the criteria.

The External Examiners are members of the Programme Examination Committee and decisions are ratified by the RIBA Examinations Committee. External Examiners' reports are submitted to APQU and are then circulated at School and Departmental level for comments. They are discussed at the Annual Programme Review and the Examiners then receive feedback on their comments. The External Examiners confirmed that the Examination Management is open to suggestions from them. The Associate Dean of the School in which the Department of Architecture is located makes the initial response to the External Examiners' reports and can respond to anything urgent, but the considered response comes from the Programme Management Committee. External Examiners are informed of the Department's response to their comments through the minutes of the relevant committees.

One of the External Examiners expressed the view that the recent attachment of the Office-Based Examination to a school of architecture had brought significant improvements. The intrinsic value of the system was apparent but it had needed to modernise to survive. He

reported that he had seen remarkable progression since the franchise arrangement was agreed. When first appointed he was not asked to interview candidates, but now the processes paralleled those of Oxford Brookes University and the External Examiners do meet candidates. The handbook had also improved, drawing on the School of Architecture's expertise at producing such documents.

The External Examiners were impressed by the great diversity, richness of experience and maturity of the candidates. Undertaking the Office-Based Examination is a positive choice for the candidates.

The External Examiners considered that some project and design briefs were not sufficiently challenging, although they are gradually being updated. Some new ones had proved inappropriate but the Examination management team was aware of this. Having said, that, there was an evenness, solidity and 'buildability' to the candidates' design work which is attributable to the tutoring as well as the project briefs. The standard of design has been lifted by the connection with Oxford Brookes University and the obligation to appoint a tutor.

According to the outgoing External Examiner, the majority of candidates compare with the lower half of those on comparable awards. The External Examiner thought that more control is now exercised over tutors and mentors which is having a beneficial effect on candidate achievement. The ability to have a dialogue with tutors and other candidates via workshops is of benefit. The candidates who performed best had been seeing their tutors regularly. The External Examiner thought tutors might need more incentive to engage in dialogue with their

candidates. It was suggested that the Examination Management might investigate further training of tutors to raise ambition and improve standards in other areas.

The External Examiners believe that more linkages between the Office-Based Examination and schools of architecture would provide tremendous opportunities. This year's graduates had particular strengths in practical areas and office management, and Externals find greater technical competence amongst the Office-Based Examination candidates than those at a school of architecture. They were confident that baseline standards was sound and that the level of marking was fair. This is helped by the regulation that candidates may not present for examination unless ready. However, one did believe that if the passmark were set at 40% rather than 50% this would allow for a wider spread across the classifications.

There was a variation in the level of ambition of the candidates. Areas in which candidates are not as strong were writing and theory; however, candidates now also present cultural and technical reports which is a great improvement. The Externals believe that candidates can now be encouraged to aim for higher intellectual aspirations and to increase the amount of their reading. The External Examiners wondered whether the way the programmes were set and written could become a helpful teaching tool, even though strictly speaking it is an examination. They hoped it might encourage candidates to look at precedents in a more sophisticated way and do more reading around a particular area.

The Board commended the contribution of the first External Examiner who was appointed to the Examination at a crucial period in its history.

13.13 Arrangements for Monitoring Professional Experience

Candidates at both Part One and Part Two are required to keep a Professional Experience Diary. This must be submitted at specified times during the course. In the case of Part One candidates at both of the Part One portfolio review assessments (D1a and D1b) and at the Part Two portfolio review assessment (D4). It must be a reflective, critical self-evaluation of the candidates' work and experience and not a simple record of work undertaken.

13.14 Candidates

The Board was pleased to meet Part One and Part Two candidates, graduates, tutors and mentors in an excellent and highly informative meeting. The Board was particularly impressed that many had travelled from outside the UK.

All attendees participated fully in a lively discussion. The Board was impressed by the enthusiasm displayed by the candidates and found the sustained loyalty and commitment of tutors, mentors and their employers remarkable.

It was evident from the discussion that the Office-Based Examination provides a highly valued and important route to qualification. One candidate described it as a 'saviour' for people in their position. Candidates are attracted to this route for many reasons.

Many had realised after years in practice that they needed a professional qualification, perhaps for credibility or advancement in the workplace or for personal satisfaction. The Office-Based Examination was the only way to

become professionally qualified if returning to university for many years was not a practical option. Candidates are aware before they embark on it that it is a challenging route.

There is a great sense of responsibility among candidates, tutors and mentors to ensure it continues and develops. Those who had already been enrolled on the programme prior to Oxford Brookes' involvement confirmed that great improvements had been made, notably:

- The feedback from Oxford Brookes University is very professional and helpful.
- Many employees believed that having a candidate on the programme brings great benefits to an office as the candidate communicates what he or she has learned to colleagues. Candidates believe their offices take them more seriously and allocate more interesting work. This view was corroborated by mentors, who said that the office culture is enhanced, particularly in small firms.
- Some firms have even financed study trips for the office as a result.
- Candidates have discovered that it has fired their desire to design.
- Finding a good tutor is key. The relationship between candidates and tutors is fundamental. The process of finding a tutor has become easier since Oxford Brookes took over managing the examinations. The support offered by Oxford Brookes was 'fantastic'.
- The handbook is more user-friendly than previously. It sets more of an agenda. It is a good working document and candidates do use it as a checklist against their projects.

Candidates, tutors and mentors suggested further changes that might be made in order to improve the candidates' experience. These included:

- The RIBA and Oxford Brookes are clear in their own minds that they are offering an examination and not a course. The perception of the candidates is slightly different. Some remarked that it should 'get off the fence' about whether it is a course or an examination. Candidates believe that in the present system they cannot make the best use of their critics because the work is being examined and it cannot be used as a guidance session. This is seen by candidates as a missed opportunity. They believe that they do not benefit from the same dialogue that takes place in a traditional school of architecture. They do benefit from the dialogue with their tutors but tutors have no direct contact with the Department of Architecture.
- Candidates should be able to present their office work to be validated. The 'course' should complement office activities, not duplicate them. Candidates believe that technology is one of their strengths as this is done in their offices on a daily basis and they should be able to submit this work for assessment.
- Offices should be made more accountable, being obliged to ensure that candidates are given appropriate work. The employer should be interviewed and made to understand the needs of the candidate and the requirements of the examination.
- Design presents a greater challenge. It was commented that many of the younger candidates are not given design work in offices, and the design component of the examination should be increased to compensate for this.

-
- Comments on the feedback sheet can be hard to decipher; they do not constitute design direction and it can be hard to ‘read between the lines’.
 - There should be compulsory design workshops, either organised by Oxford Brookes or by candidates. One candidate remarked that tutors at the interim and final crit did give some constructive feedback in the form of positive, focussed and directional comments. Although guidance from individual tutors is valuable, the opinions of a fresh set of eyes would be welcome. It was noted that the Examination management team had asked candidates whether they would like workshops and trips abroad. Those at the present meeting had welcomed the idea but assumed that the majority of replies had been negative as apparently nothing had happened.
 - An opportunity to meet full time students at Oxford Brookes University would be helpful. Tutors and candidates can both feel isolated. At present candidates are heavily reliant on tutors for feedback. As this is a very difficult and arduous route, candidates need peer support. Some tutors do take their candidates into the schools in which they teach which they find useful.
 - Prospective tutors need to question whether they wish to take on the role as it is arduous for them too. Tutors are reliant on the candidate for feedback from crit sessions, which can vary in reliability depending on the candidate. Tutors are helped by the workshop run by Oxford Brookes.
 - Written work should concentrate on design and history and theory.
 - It can be difficult to find suitable work for a Part Two candidate in a big firm that handles very large projects.
- Candidates reported that cultural context can be a daunting and overwhelming element of the examination, particularly for those from a more technical background. There is a steep learning curve.
 - Some commented that more personal development guidance in the first year of Part Two would be helpful. Other candidates prefer not to be given too much direction.
 - One of the most beneficial activities is the opportunity to develop their own briefs. Candidates would not want to use “artificial” briefs from other schools.
 - Tutors would have liked more guidance to help them write briefs at the appropriate level. Previous documentation for tutors was fragmented and voluminous but has improved. Some tutors are still worried about whether they are giving the right advice, particularly with regard to appropriate pass levels and sizes of project; however, others thought that the handbook was too strait-jacketed.

The Board understood that past candidates are very supportive of present candidates and a network of contacts is gradually building up. The meeting made it clear that there was considerable advantage for offices in having a member of staff enrolled with the RIBA Office-Based Examination as it raises the aspirations of both candidates and their colleagues.

At the time of the visit 30 candidates were registered for Part One and 70 for Part Two. These numbers do not include 14 candidates who had suspended their studies for 2006-2007, as they are entitled to do. The RIBA is not anticipating a sharp increase in the number of applicants in spite of the increasing costs of full-time education

proves prohibitive, but believes that there will be a gradual increase in demand, for which it is prepared.

The Board believed that the progress of the examination and the achievement of the candidates was not being held back by lack of aspiration on the part of the candidates as there was clearly great ambition, commitment and determination amongst them.

The RIBA acknowledges that the level of pastoral care for candidates is highly dependent upon the individual tutor, which can vary, and that this needs to be addressed formally as good relationships between candidates and tutors are essential to the effective running of the programme. Oxford Brookes University has such systems in place for students enrolled on its own programmes but access to this is not part of the present arrangement.

13.15 Tutors and Mentors

Tutors are selected and paid by the candidates, who are given guidance by Oxford Brookes. Oxford Brookes comments on the CVs, identifying areas in which the tutor will be able to help candidates or pointing out areas in which they might need additional help, but does not approve the choice of tutor. Oxford Brookes also issues guidance to tutors.

It is up to the candidate how little or how much they use their tutor. There is an annual agreement which must be signed by the tutor and the mentor, which has been very useful as the tutor has to sign whether the candidate is 'ready to present'. There is a database of tutors; however, its use has been limited as data protection legislation means that permission is needed from individuals to release their names. The Examination management usually

suggests that candidates approach their nearest school of architecture when seeking a tutor.

Tutors have an open invitation to attend portfolio workshops and crits as observers, but they do not participate in the process. Feedback from candidates, mentors and tutors has been very positive and this is fed into the annual review process. At present the Examination Management team were not aware of any failures in the relationship between tutors and candidates.

The Board notes the recommendation of the 2002 Visiting Board that the appointment of personal tutors be formalised. The Board acknowledges that this was addressed in 2003 and that measures taken were deemed satisfactory by the RIBA and the ARB. However, the present Board recommends that this be further enhanced as tutors are still uncertain of their precise role in supporting candidates. The Board recommends that the Examination Management continue to investigate ways of keeping tutors better informed to serve the needs of candidates and the aims of the examinations. The anticipated growth of the course will make this more important. Even though the current remit makes no provision for formal teaching, this may have to be addressed as the Examination grows.

13.16 Staff

The staff meeting was well attended and the Board found that all present participated in an interesting and informative discussion. As there are no teaching staff, as would be found in a school setting, the Board was interested in exploring where the staff believed the learning took place, and to what extent the candidates'

learning was influenced and driven by Oxford Brookes. Although it accepts that Oxford Brookes is responsible officially only for the setting, marking and quality assurance of an examination and attendant activities, the Board believes that there is some blurring of the distinction.

It was noted that Examination management has been discussing credit-rating the programme. However, a cost/benefit analysis would need to be conducted before any such decision was made. Such a step could make the process longer and more expensive, and could exclude the very people the initiative is intending to attract and assist.

The Board wished to explore exactly where learning takes place, and the level of design influence Oxford Brookes and tutors have over the candidates. The Board believed that there are three major design influences; the candidates' practice, the tutor and Oxford Brookes University, albeit indirectly. Oxford Brookes can influence design through the guidance it gives to tutors, the briefs and the reading list. Candidates now have the opportunity to learn from one another with open days, portfolio reviews/portfolio workshops. These are important elements as they lessen the feeling of isolation. The Board believed a lot of learning is out of the academics' control and the brief is the chief tool for managing this and striving for higher standards. The last Visiting Board encouraged more experimental design. The present Board appreciates that this is difficult to achieve in the circumstances, but recognises that the guidance documents encourage experimentation.

Although the level of design achievement is not one of the strengths of the programme, the examiners have seen an

improvement in design work over the last few years. This is attributed partly to the new briefs and guidance developed by Oxford Brookes University and partly to the calibre of candidates. Interim reviews are the only opportunity candidates have to see what standards they have to attain. Candidates are also invited to the Oxford Brookes University School of Architecture's Final Year Exhibition. Externals are all experienced examiners at conventional schools which also safeguards standards. Candidates are given better feedback and Oxford Brookes design tutors crit the work. The organisers would also like to include work on the website that would serve as examples to prospective candidates.

13.17 Equal Opportunities:

Equal Opportunities Monitoring is undertaken by the RIBA. There is great potential for the Examination to help candidates from non-traditional backgrounds to enter the profession. At present the majority of candidates are mature and male. The diversity of candidates is slowly beginning to broaden, particularly with more women and more candidates from minority ethnic backgrounds. There is at present a limited budget for proactive marketing and the examination relies chiefly on word of mouth recommendation to attract potential candidates. If the examinations could be actively marketed it could reach a wider range of candidates.

13.18 Resourcing and facilities;

Oxford Brookes University provides venues for specific activities in relation to the Office-Based Examination. This chiefly involves space for design assessments, portfolio reviews, preparation workshops, induction sessions, and formal written examinations. Formal written examinations are also conducted at other locations in the

UK and Eire for those unable to travel to Oxford. The annual guest lecture and graduation ceremony are held at the RIBA's headquarters in London. Candidates may also use the RIBA Library, which houses a Loan Library, an extensive Photograph and Slide Collection and Drawings Collection.

At the time of the Visiting Board, significant building work was underway affecting the Department's premises. When this has been completed, the Board hopes an appropriately professional environment can be provided for candidates during their sessions at the Department.

The Board particularly commends the key role played by the full-time course administrator and her extraordinary contribution to the running of the Examination and the level of service and support afforded prospective and enrolled candidates.

14. Documentation Provided

Prior to the visit the RIBA provided:

Critical Self-Appraisal
RIBA Examination in Architecture for Office-Based Candidates, Questionnaire
Syllabus, Guide and Regulations for the RIBA Examinations in Architecture for Office-Based Candidates, Revised March 2003
Guide, Syllabus and Regulations Issued January 2006.

In the Base Room, Oxford Brookes University and the RIBA provided:

Mapping Addendum
Complete External Examiners' reports

Part 1: Examination Questions
Part 1: Elective Essay titles

Part 2: Examination Questions
Part 2: Dissertation topics

Equal opportunities and diversity monitoring
Extracted from the Guide, Syllabus, and Regulations for the RIBA Examination in Architecture for Office-Based Candidates; January 2006 – to be sent to all prospective candidates
Guide, Syllabus and Regulations
Syllabus, Guide and Regulations revised March 2005
Addenda to Guide, Syllabus and Regulations March 2003
Syllabus, Guide and Regulations (1997 edition)
Oxford Brookes University School of Architecture RIBA Examination in Architecture for Office-Based Candidates – Final Draft (11 February 2002)
Operations Manual 2002
RIBA Examinations and Curricular Development Committee – Minutes and Papers September 2001-date

Part One and Part Two Sample Starter Packs including –

- Open University Good Study Guide
- 2006 Registration Documents
- Equal Opportunities Form
- Programme Questionnaire
- Advice for new candidates
- Examination techniques
- Past exam questions
- Examples of design project briefs
- Guidelines for personal tutors

CVs for Oxford Brookes Staff, RIBA staff, External Examiners

Internal programme examination meetings minutes
November 2002-February 2006

Programme Examination Committee July 2002-March
2006

- Minutes
- Results
- Progression

Programme Management Committee May 2002-January
2006

Annual Review 2003-2004, 2004-2005, 2005-2006

Questionnaires 2005-2006 (completed forms, with short
written summary and analysis)
Part 1 and Part 2 – file of application form and all
standard letters