

**Royal Institute of British Architects**

**Report of the RIBA Visiting Board  
to London South Bank University**

Confirmed by RIBA Education Committee 26 November 2008

**Department of Architecture and Design  
Faculty of Engineering, Science and the  
Built Environment**

**Part One: Bachelor of Arts with Honours of  
Architecture**

**Part Two: Post Graduate Diploma in  
Architecture**

**Part Three: Professional Practice**

Date of Visiting Board: 26 and 27 June 2008

K:\Validation\UK Visits\Visits 2007-08\London South Bank\Confirmed report.doc

**1. Information About the Courses**

**1.1 Courses offered for revalidation:**

1.2

London South Bank University, Bachelor of Arts with Honours in Architecture, Part One, 3 years full-time, 5 years part-time

London South Bank University, Post Graduate Diploma in Architecture 2 years full-time, 3 years part-time

London South Bank University, Professional Practice, Part Three course, part-time

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

Department of Architecture and Design  
Engineering, Science and the Built Environment  
London South Bank University  
103 Borough Road  
London  
SE1 OAA

**T:** 020 7815 7224

**W:** www.lscbu.ac.uk

**1.2 Name of Awarding Body**

London South Bank University

**1.3 Name of Head of School**

Mary- Jane Rooney

**2. Membership of the Visiting Board**

2.1 The members of the RIBA Visiting Board for the visit on 26-27 June 2008 were:

Professor Jim Low (Chair)  
Virginia Newman  
Layton Reid  
Ruth Reed  
Sheila Ryding (Co-Professional Member)  
Kevin Edgington (Graduate/Student Member)

Sarah Bedding (RIBA) was in attendance as Secretary to the Board.

Richard Cann was in attendance as institutional facilitator

John Paul Nunes, Head of Education Projects at the RIBA was in attendance as an observer for part of 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, 'Tomorrow's Architect,' published March 2003, effective from September 2003,

and 'Description & Regulations for the recognition of courses, programmes and examinations in Professional Practice and Management, (Part 3) in the UK. For more information see [www.architecture.com](http://www.architecture.com).

**4. Recommendations of the Visiting Board Confirmed by the Royal Institute of British Architects Education Committee 26 November 2008**

4.1 At its meeting on 26 November 2008 the RIBA Education Committee confirmed Continued Validation of:

Part One: London South Bank University, Bachelor of Arts with Honours in Architecture, 3 years full time or 5 years part time

Part Two : London South Bank University, Post Graduate Diploma in Architecture, 2 years full time, or 3 years part time

Part Three: London South Bank University, Professional Practice, part time

4.2 The next Visiting Board will take place in 2012.

**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 courses met the Construction Industry Council Common Learning Outcomes for Degree Courses in the Built Environment

5.3 The Visiting Board recommends to ARB that the Part 1 & 2 courses 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 courses 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 Architecture is a discipline well established with a strong history from its origins in the Brixton School of Building. The Department of Architecture had recently moved to a new location at the University's main campus near Elephant and Castle at the time of the previous Visiting Board. The Department has adjusted well to the changes this move has brought about, however the use of space within the Department is an ongoing cause for concern. Since the previous Visiting Board, a new Head of Department has been appointed and the Board was pleased to observe the positive impact this was having on the Department as a whole.

10.2 The School's strengths include:

- An experienced and committed team of staff

- An impressive dedication to widening participation in Higher Education, and the added value achieved as a result.
- The central location in London, the healthy links with the local practices and the stimulating surroundings which produce diversity in the design projects.
- The well supported and strongly structured part-time route through the course.

### 10.3 Recommendations

The Visiting Board has made the following recommendations. The RIBA expects 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.

10.3.1 The Board recommends the School address the accommodation within the department as a matter of urgency. The rigidity of the building is obstructive to the students learning experience and undermines the ethos of that which would be expected of a full time architecture course. The current studio space appears to inhibit studio culture and results in an apparently fragmented student body. Amongst the particular provisions that should be reassessed are; the use of the mezzanine resulting in interruption of studio time, and particularly crits, by external guests, the inappropriate lighting and the proximity of staff offices to students.

10.3.2 The Board recommends that in order for the department to continue running efficiently, the Head of Department needs additional administrative support.

10.4 Advice

10.4.1 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 advises the School to move the Part 3 to a recognised University award.

10.4.2 The Board welcomes and encourages the review of the structure and delivery of the Part 2 course; the Board advises a review of unit structure with a view to decreasing the numbers of students in each studio.

## 11. Summary of Previous Visiting Board Reports

11.1 The last RIBA Visiting Board to London South Bank University took place on the 24/25 June 2004. The Board recommended that Continued Validation be granted to:

Part One: Bachelor of Arts with Honours in Architecture,  
3 years full time, 5 years part time

Part Two: Post Graduate Diploma in Architecture  
2 years full time, 3 years part time

Part Three: Professional Practice, part time only

11.2 In its report, the 2004 Visiting Board commented:

“The Department is one of five in the newly formed Faculty of Engineering, Science and Built Environment. Architecture has moved from its previous location on the University’s Wandsworth Road campus to the main University campus adjacent to Elephant and Castle. The Board could see that the move brought many benefits for the Department, particularly improved links with other related areas of work and ease of access to other university facilities and the cultural centre of London. At the time of the visit, many of the benefits were not fully realised.

The previous visiting Boards in 1999 and 2000 raised a number of concerns, but it was clear to this board that the Department had responded positively to the majority of issues raised. In particular, the Part Three programme was seen by this Board to be one of the real strengths of the Department.”

A more detailed summary of the 2004 Report can be downloaded from [www.architecture.com](http://www.architecture.com)

## 12. Commentary

12.1 **Self-Appraisal and Developments since the last visit**

The previous Visiting Board in 2004, took place immediately after the move from Wandsworth Road, this move had resulted in some physical fragmentation. A new Head of Department was appointed in 2006, and a new course management team was put in place with new

course director. The Department moved from vertical ateliers in the BA (Hons) course to a year system in 2006. A new admission strategy has also been put in place to improve the calibre of students coming on to the course, whilst maintaining the Department's commitment to wider participation. Since the last visit the workshops have been refurbished and restructured. There are better arrangements for access to and use of the workshops. The Board was pleased to note the new provision of a base room for sole use by the Architecture department, with improved proximity to the workshops.

## 12.2 Documentation and Arrangements for the Visit

The documentation for the visit was mostly supplied in timely fashion and was comprehensive and well structured. The Board was also grateful for the prompt response of the Department in supplying all additional documentation requested during the visit.

The overall programme worked smoothly. The Board appreciated the help provided by the Institutional Facilitator, particularly in sourcing additional information. The Exhibition was well structured and gave a clear introduction into the organisation of the courses and design projects. The portfolios were effectively organised and accompanied by clear mark sheets.

### 12.2.1 *Record of Academic Portfolios sampled during the visit*

For the Part One BA (Hons) programme, the Board examined the following academic portfolios of work completed in the 2007/8 academic year  
Year 1: 3 lowest pass, 2 middle pass and 2 high passes

Year 2: lowest pass from each studio, 2 middle passes (any studio) 2 high passes  
Year 3: lowest pass from each studio, 2 middle passes (any studio). 2 high passes (any studio)

For the Part Two PGDip programme, the Board examined the following academic portfolios of work completed during the 2007/8 academic year

Year 1: lowest pass from each studio plus 2 middle and 2 high pass  
Year 2: lowest pass from each studio, 2 middle pass and 2 high pass

The sample of academic portfolios presented by the department included both full time and part time portfolios and a number of fail portfolios for comparison

For the Part Three programme, the Board examined all assessed work from the three lowest, two middle and two high pass candidates from each of the two cohorts that graduated during the academic year 2007/8

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

The Board is satisfied that the Department have addressed the points made by previous Visiting Board and External Examiners. The Critical Self Appraisal explicitly outlines the areas in which the Department has addressed previous concerns.

**12.3 Context of the courses within the wider provision of the school and Faculty.**

The Faculty was restructured in 2003 when all Built Environment teaching transferred from Wandsworth Road to the Elephant and Castle campus. Architecture became part of a Department of Architecture and Design in the Faculty of Engineering Science and the Built Environment. The Faculty is organised into five Departments Applied Science, Architecture and Design, Electrical, Computer and Communications Engineering, Engineering Systems and Property Surveying and Construction. Architecture and Design were combined as one Department connected in 2003 but still maintain strong individual identities due to their historic background.

**12.5 Detailed Commentary on the Course leading to Part One qualification**

**12.5.1 Clarity, validity and achievement of course objectives**

The Board is satisfied that the portfolios showed objectives were being met.

**12.5.2 Course design and content**

The Board considered that the Part 1 course was well structured and appropriately challenging in content. The Board observes that all the criteria are being met in the 3<sup>rd</sup> year. The Board welcomed the introduction of the Personal Development Plans. The Board found the 1<sup>st</sup> year to be exciting, with interesting projects and enthusiastic staff. Overall the Board considered the 1<sup>st</sup> year to be a strength of the course and felt that the move to a year structure addresses the parity issue and results in greater consistency across the student work. The Board

members were concerned that the workload of the Final Year Part Time students (year 5) was too high. These students followed the full time project schedule, despite having already taken some of the modules in the previous year.

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

- Design

On the basis of the sample of portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the BA (Hons) Architecture are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Design. The Board found interesting and imaginative design work of a high standard being produced in the Part 1 course. The scope of the design projects in the 1<sup>st</sup> year enabled students to shine. The Board also believes that the Department could do more to support part time students to develop their ability to critically appraise their own design processes

- Technology & Environment

On the basis of the sample of portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the BA (Hons) Architecture are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Technology and Environment. The Board observed from the students work that overall there was a wide range of knowledge and understanding of Technology and Environmental issues. However in some cases, the Board felt that the integration of Technology and Environment was unsophisticated; some of the weaker students needed better support in order to strengthen their skills in this area. The Board was

impressed by the School's links with Grimshaw Architects and how the building next to the School was being used as a sustainability case study. In addition to this the Board applauded the use of consultant lecturers in the area of Technology and Environment.

- Cultural Context

On the basis of the sample of portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the BA (Hons) Architecture are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Cultural Context.

- Communication

On the basis of the sample of portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the BA (Hons) Architecture are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Communication. The Board wishes to applaud the developing use of models within students' project work. The Board thought that the level of communication was commendable, especially given the diversity the students.

- Management Practice & Law

On the basis of the sample of portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the BA (Hons) Architecture are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Management Practice and Law. At the top end of the ability range the work was very good; however, the Board was concerned that at the bottom end there was not always sufficient feedback to convey to students how they could improve for the future. Overall the Board was satisfied that the Department was performing well in this area.

- Preparation for Professional Experience, (Part 1 only)  
The Board applauds the School's commitment to preparing students for employment. Students benefit greatly from the pride the School takes in ensuring their students are highly employable. The School's links to local practises and the substantial involvement of practitioners as visiting lecturers in Part One teaching is also extremely helpful in this respect.

12.5.4 Progression within the course

The School admits there is a low progression rate amongst their students but attributes this to the standard of intake. The diverse intake results in problems with progression but this does not appear to be an issue for the university. The School recognises that it may take longer for students to progress, and the Board wishes to commend the aims and flexibility of the University in relation to the diversity of their student body. In addition to this, given the current resources, the Board wishes to acknowledge the hard work of staff in assisting the diverse student population in completing the course.

12.5.5 Assessment:

The Board found the School to be using a traditional and balanced range of assessment techniques throughout the Part One programme. The assessment mechanisms allow students to sufficiently demonstrate that they have met the RIBA criteria. On the basis of their observations, the Board was assured that the pass level was correct.

12.5.6 Admissions and arrangements for direct entry at a stage other than the start of the course

The Board noted the School's arrangements for students entering the course other than at the start, notably through the Accreditation of Prior (Experiential) Learning method (APEL). The Board observed that the wide access provided by the university is a strong point, and the students commented that in some cases this provision had been the attraction to the course. The Department has, since 2006 placed a greater emphasis on open days and individual interviews for all its courses with a deliberate aim of more closely matching candidates to the course. This is improving the calibre of students at all levels. The Board commended the School's intentions to interview all candidates with a view to raising standards.

**12.6 Detailed Commentary on the Course leading to Part Two qualification**

**12.6.1 Clarity, validity and achievement of course objectives.**

The School runs a three studio system in the Part 2 programme; Studios 6, 7, and 8. A complementary series of lectures and seminars supports taught course submissions. The Board considered the course documentation to be satisfactory, and that course objectives were being achieved.

**12.6.2 Course design and content**

The Board welcomes the intention to review the course content at Part 2 in the coming academic session. The Board also supports the idea of developing course structures and the opportunity for students to move between studios. The Board recommends the Department explore a wider, more challenging, range of projects, with students encouraged to develop their own briefs. The

Board wishes to remind the School that Unit Guides should be adhered to and mapped to the project briefs in order to meet the criteria.

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

**-Design**

On the basis of the sample of portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Postgraduate Diploma in Architecture are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Design. As per previous Visiting Board comments however, the Board found some variability between the standard of work produced within the studios at Part 2. The Board felt that, in part, this might be addressed if students received more guidance in respect of the studio they worked in; a better match was required between the nature of the work being undertaken and the ability of the student group.

The Board found a high level of design competence in Studio 6, and particularly Studio 8. However, the Board had some concerns with Studio 7 where it was considered that the briefs and aims of the unit were insufficiently ambitious to stretch weaker students who had greater difficulty in demonstrating the complexity required for diploma projects.

**- Technology and Environment**

On the basis of the portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Postgraduate Diploma in Architecture are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Technology & Environment. Although all students met the criteria, the Board did consider that the integration could be more adventurous and would like to see more Technological and Environmental issues informing the students' design work. The

Board believes that the project briefs could be revisited in order to give students the opportunity to address Technological issues. In addition to this, the Board felt that there should be greater opportunity for students to demonstrate their understanding of environmental and structural services. The Board is hopeful that the recent staff appointments will help the School achieve this.

- Cultural Context

On the basis of the portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Postgraduate Diploma in Architecture are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Cultural Context.

- Communication

On the basis of the portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Postgraduate Diploma in Architecture are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of communication. The Board welcomes the use of modelling and believes the workshops have enabled more 3D modelling.

- Management, Practice and Law

On the basis of the sample of portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Postgraduate Diploma in Architecture are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Management Practice and Law. The Board was interested in the graphic approach to C.V writing. The Board felt that the lecture series provided excellent coverage of the criteria in this area. The subject of building costing is dealt with particularly well.

**12.7 Detailed Commentary on the Course leading to Part Three Qualification**

12.7.1 On the basis of the Part Three work examined, the Board confirms that:

- All graduates from London South Bank University Professional Practise (Part Three) are meeting all the Part Three Validation Criteria;
- Minimum pass standards are being set at an appropriate level.

12.7.2 Course design and content

The Board strongly recommends making the Part Three qualification a London South Bank University award. The Board felt this would allow a review of the balance of the content of the course and the topics of assessment. The Board felt that there was currently a bias towards legislation and regulation in the delivered course. The syllabus covering practise management was not sufficiently detailed. The Board was concerned that the course maintained its relevance and is kept up to date with current practise.

12.7.3 The Board noted that the assessment of the Part Three course was related to both the lecture series and students' practical experience.

12.7.4 Currently the administration of the course and course information records are kept in paper form in a separate building to where the course is delivered. The Board thought it would increase efficiency in some areas to make use of digital media and deliver the course electronically

**12.8 External examining arrangements**

The Board confirmed that the School had in place a strong team of External Examiners. The Board found the Part One Examiners to be particularly supportive of the School and University, they felt that their feedback and been responded to, and the work they have examined is of a consistently high standard. The Board would recommend that the number of External Examiners be

kept under review and any additional appointments be made in light of increased student numbers at Part One and Part Two. The Board was concerned about the disparity between the pedagogical ethos of the School at part 2 - which it supported - and the critical comments of one of the External Examiners; these comments appeared to be inconsistent with the quality of evidence presented to the Board.

The undergraduate and post graduate examiners praised the staff's enthusiasm and commitment to their students. The examiners are impressed with the positive and caring attitude of the staff but also pointed out the need for some new contemporary and lively staff to energise the course. The Post Graduate examiners noted that the diploma operates the same three units as it did ten years ago and the course could be refreshed in this area. But the teaching is very good and enthusiastic. The examiners highlighted the need for more administrative support, both in support of the Head of School and in terms of the work that needs to be done to keep track of the students at Part Three. The Board was pleased to note that the Part Three Examiner was supportive of change.

The examiners applauded the work of the University in addressing wide sector of people that many other institutions do not reach, and recognised the important work the University does for the profession.

#### 12.9 **Arrangements for Monitoring Professional Experience**

The Board noted that the students were not subject to a formal registration process during their Part One Professional Experience. The Board were concerned that the registration of students and monitoring of their

Professional Experience is a time consuming task currently undertaken by the Head of Department. The Board suggests that the School should put in place a member of staff other than the Head of Department to monitor Professional Experience throughout the Department.

#### 12.10 **Students;**

The Board had a lively and informed meeting with students representing all parts of the course. The Board was pleased to note that the students attending the meeting reflected the diversity of backgrounds and age ranges. The Board had a constructive discussion with the students, and found them to be committed and enthusiastic about Architecture at London South Bank University. The students supported the work of their tutors and the Head of School and recognised the benefits of the personal touch they received despite the large numbers within the cohorts. The students commended the work of the Computer Technician and the support he gives them. The students also praised the flexibility of the entry policy and the Part Time course. The University's positive attitude to mature students' needs was also seen as an attribute of the course.

Part Three students felt that the fast track element of the course was commendable.. Some Part Time students admitted they felt isolated from their year group and found it hard to access the workshop and their tutors. However, Part Time students recognised the tutors' efforts to provide them with the support they needed. The students overall expressed an appreciation of the School's commitment to ensuring they develop their individual thinking and identity.

Amongst the concerns raised by the students were:

- The students were concerned that the nature of the space of the Department created a fragmented student body but the students recognised the Department was attempting to address this issue. The lack of a dedicated space for Architecture meant that the students felt they did not have a base or enough storage space for models. The students felt there was a tendency for students to attend their own crits but there was not much opportunity for interaction between year groups and units due to studio time being strictly allocated by year groups..
- The students felt that in particular their learning experience is disadvantaged by the mezzanine noise in the studio space. In particular, the disturbance created by external events and the disruptive effect they had on the students working in the studios below or having crits within the space.
- The high intake of students at Year 1. Some students were concerned that the numbers were too high given there were only three design studios
- Would like more regular contact with staff
- The Full Time students are not full time because of the lack of space and tutorial contact.
- Greater communication would assist the fragmented student body, at present there is not a well organised departmental notice board. Some students were concerned that the electronic learning programme, Blackboard is insufficiently powerful. The Students expressed a concern that they were not part of a cohesive group.

- Some students were concerned that the Head of Department needed more support in her role as Head as well as Group Tutor. The students felt that the course would benefit from better management overall.

#### 12.11 **Staff;**

The Visiting Board had a constructive and open meeting with staff members. The Board was pleased to note a number of part-time staff drawn from practise attended the meeting. The Board explored with staff how the move to a new building had affected the function of the Architecture School. The staff believe the move to the Keyworth Building has enhanced the image of the School but the space was not conducive to a positive student experience and created a fragmented School body. The new studios do not allow messy work and the students are unable to make models within the space. Experimental media cannot be used because of Health and Safety measures, and Fine Art practice is impossible in the new space.

The Staff commented on the lack of a cohesive secretarial support system. The staff asserted that the Head of Department required further administrative support, they believe it is impossible for her to carry out her role as Head without a dedicated Personal Assistant, located in the same building as herself. In addition to this Part Three generates a lot of paperwork of a confidential nature which has to be stored in a separate building to where the School is based. There are no pigeon holes for Architecture in the same building as the staff offices.

The staff also highlighted the issues with the mezzanine and the noise from the balcony clashing with crits and the lack of storage space for models.

The staff praised the work of the Head of Department. They applauded her commitment and the changes she has brought about in the new lecture course and the new members of staff. The policy of interviewing all applicants has had a positive effect on the standards amongst the cohorts, and the Department is now attracting students from other institutions.

The impact of the hourly lecturers has been positive and the lecturers themselves have felt integrated and fully supported by the Head of Department from the beginning.

The current SSR is 1:25; the department is at the top end of national standards in this respect. The Department has a mission to widen participation, and improve academic standards; this needs to be supported by the university with improved staff student ratios, a figure closer to the national average of 1:16 would assist this agenda. The Board therefore recommends the University closely monitor this ratio, and ensures it does not impair the Department in meeting its aims. The Board recommends that the university works towards achieving a significantly improved figure to ensure that the Department achieves its objectives.

#### 12.12 Research;

The Department has not contributed to recent RAE returns within the faculty and conceded it is a weakness that there is no co-ordinated approach to Research within Department or the Faculty related to Architecture. However, the Board noted that although individually a number of staff are research active, others carry out scholarly work and take part in practice based research. The Board recommended that the department put in place sufficient mechanisms to support their professional development. Current courses have sufficient maturity to develop successful Masters programme which would enhance the department academically and support the mission of the University as a whole.

#### 12.12 Equal Opportunities:

The Board was impressed with the University's commendable approach to equal opportunities and widening participation through the recruitment of students from diverse backgrounds. The average age of students entering the course is 25 and the proportion of ethnic minority students is well above the national average for Schools of Architecture. The Board had some concerns at the apparent gender imbalance amongst the staff, with female members making up about 20% of the total numbers of teaching staff. The Board suggests the Department addresses the gender and age profile of the staff when opportunities arise. The Board were however informed that, since 2006, three women have been appointed on a sessional or HPL basis, a further woman appointed to teach in the third year of BA (Hons) on a 0,5 lecturer appointment, and a senior female member of staff promoted to principal lecturer.

12.14 **Resourcing and facilities**

**Studio**

The Board was concerned that the comments of the previous Visiting Board had not been addressed. The Board recommends the use of the mezzanine by external guests is reviewed. The Board was also concerned that the lack of storage space conspires against the studio culture and disadvantages the students. The space does not support the diversity of the students nor does it provide the necessary space for students to satisfactorily display their work and their ability to meet the criteria.

**Library**

The library has approximately 10,000 books for Architecture, and that includes 1 core text for every 20 students. The space was well used, with seating for 600 students and there was enough shelf space to prevent the need to archive. There were effective mechanisms in place for Part Time students to reserve books remotely, and titles can be sent to distance learners.

**Workshops**

The Department welcomes the University's provision for their own base room. There are some issues with part-time students finding it difficult to gain access to the workshops. The Board is interested in the addition of a laser cutter and 3D printer and looks forward to the impact these will have on the students' work.

**Computers**

Appropriate packages needed to be installed on computer facilities nearer to the studios. The facilities in the Learning Resources centre were good, with late opening

hours and A1 and A2 colour printers and plotters. The initial progress on Blackboard has been encouraging but the facility needs to be used to its full potential. Enhanced use of the Virtual Learning Environment (VLE) will support the part-time learners.

**13. Attachments**

Record of the documentation provided before and during the visit. Course structure diagrams for courses recommended for Validation (as provided by the school prior to the visit).

- Critical Self Appraisal Document 1
- RIBA Visit Questionnaire Document 2
- RIBA Visit Supplementary Information Document 3
- BA (Hons) Architecture Design Projects 2007-2008
- Postgraduate Diploma Architecture Design Projects 2007-2008 Studio 6, Studio 7 and Studio 8
- Undergraduate Unit Guides + Course Structure Diagrams
- Postgraduate Unit Guides + Course Structure Diagrams
- BA (Hons) Architecture student reports
- External Examiner Reports 2004-5, 2005-6, 2006-7 (including 2 2007-2008 reports)
- Copy of QAA Report
- Copy of RIBA Mid Term Monitoring report
- Staff CVs
- School and Institution Prospectus
- Full course syllabus
- Programme Specification / Unit Syllabus / Unit Guides
- Red Boxes with Unit Guides and Student Feedback
- Timetable
- List of Dissertation Topics