

Royal Institute of British Architects

**Report of the RIBA Visiting Board
to University of Bath**

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

**Department of Architecture & Civil
Engineering
Faculty of Engineering & Design**

**Part One: BSc (Hons) General Architectural
Studies
Part Two: Master of Architecture
Part Three: Examination in Professional Practice**

Date of Visiting Board: 19 - 20 October 2006

1. Information About the Courses

1.1 Courses offered for validation

Part One: BSc (Hons) General Architectural Studies (four years thin sandwich)

Part Two: Master of Architecture (two years thin sandwich)

Part Three: Examination in Professional Practice. Professional Practice

1.2 Address of the Institution where the course is delivered

Department of Architecture & Civil Engineering
Faculty of Engineering & Design
University of Bath
Bath
BA2 7AY

Tel: 01225 386361

Fax: 01225 386691

W: www.bath.ac.uk

1.3 Name of Awarding Body

University of Bath

1.4 Name of Head of Department

Professor Tim Ibell

1.5 Name of Head of Architecture

Professor Vaughan Hart

2. Membership of the Visiting Board

2.1 The members of the RIBA Visiting Board for the visit on Thursday 14 and Friday 15 October 2004 were:

Benedicte Foo	(Chair)
David Howarth	(Vice Chair)
David Clews	
Jo van Heyningen	
Sheila Ryding	(Non Architect Member)
Trevor Eastell	(Regional Representative)
Nick Hayhurst	(Graduate Member)

Dr. Chris Ellis (Head of Validation, RIBA) was in attendance as Secretary to the Board.

Professor Jeon-Hee Ryu attended the Board as an observer on behalf of the Korean Architectural Accreditation Board.

3. Procedures & Criteria for the Visit

3.1 The Visiting Board was carried out under the "RIBA Procedures for the Validation of UK Courses and Examinations in Architecture", published Sept 2003, effective from September 2003 (as amended at RIBA Validation Committee 19.05.2005), the "RIBA Criteria for Validation", published March 2002, effective from September 2003, and the RIBA Descriptions and Regulations for the Recognition of Courses and Examinations in Professional Practice & Management, (Part Three), published November 2003.

For more information see www.architecture.com

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

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

Continued Validation of:

Part One: University of Bath Bachelor of Science (Hons) in General Architectural Studies (four years thin-sandwich)

Part Two: University of Bath Master of Architecture (two years thin sandwich).

4.2 The Visiting Board recommends to RIBA Education Committee:

Continued Validation with Conditions of:

Part Three: Examination in Professional Practice

4.3 The next full Visiting Board should take place in 2010.

5. **Recommendation of the Visiting Board to the Commonwealth Association of Architects, the Construction Industry Council & the 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 course met the Construction Industry Council Common Learning Outcomes for Degree Courses in the Built Environment.

5.3 The Visiting Board recommends to the ARB that the Part One and Part Two courses together met all points of the EU Directive.

6. **Criteria for Validation**

6.1 On the basis of the academic portfolios examined, the Visiting Board was satisfied that all graduates from all the courses listed in 4.1 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 A range of work from the previous year of the courses listed in 4.1 above 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 Part One and Part Two courses.

8.2 Overall the Board was satisfied that the work of the 2005 cohort of the Part Three programme clearly demonstrated that the Part Three Validation Criteria were being met by all graduates from the course and that minimum pass standards were being set appropriately. However in order to have confidence that this would continue to be the case

the Board requires that the course be fully validated by the University and approved by the RIBA New Courses & Course Changes Group before any promotion is undertaken for, or candidates are registered on, the next (2007/8) cohort of programme. This is to ensure that there is full compliance with university regulations on external examining, that university appeals procedures are available to candidates and that the course benefits from formal university annual monitoring and periodic review procedures.

The Board thus imposed a condition on the course as follows:

The Department must:

- achieve internal validation for the programme
- gain approval for the revised programme from the RIBA New Courses & Course Changes Group before any promotion is undertaken for, or candidates are registered on, the next (2007/8) cohort of programme.

A revisit will be undertaken by a sub-group of the Board when the work of the first cohort of the university validated programme is available to establish that the Part Three validation criteria continue to be met and that appropriate pass standards are being maintained.

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 course 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,

- iv. 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 listed in 4.1.

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

- 10.1 The provision of architecture at the University of Bath is unique in that the validated provision is run by a combined department of architecture and civil engineering. The Department has a long history of educating architects and civil engineers together under such inspired leaders as Professors Ted Happold and Michael Brawne. Substantial elements of combined teaching are a key feature of the current Part One course. The Department's Part One and Part Two architecture programmes run in a unique thin sandwich mode that seeks to integrate academic learning and practical experience. The Part One includes two periods of professional experience in years two and three of the course. The Part Two starts with a period in professional experience. The Department is based on the University's main Claverton campus just outside the city of Bath in attractive purpose-designed accommodation which remains extremely fit for purpose.
- 10.2 Specific strengths of the Department included:
- the thin sandwich structure and the opportunity it provides to students to link education and practice;
 - the experience of interdisciplinary team working resulting from the close links between architecture and civil engineering and particularly the joint design

- project work such as the "Basil Spence" project undertaken in the final year of the BSc;
- the financial strength demonstrated by the Department's position as a net contributor to university finances;
- the strong research culture demonstrated by the achievement of a grade 5 in the 2001 Research Assessment Exercise;
- the strong contribution to studio teaching made by practising architects;
- the close links with a network of prestigious European Universities which allows students the opportunity to pursue a range of SOCRATES exchanges.
- the substantial integration achieved between taught subjects and design studio work.

10.3 Recommendations

The Board has made the following recommendation to the Department. 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 department and in the mid term review. Failure by an Institution to act on the recommendation, or provide the RIBA with a clear rationale for not doing so, may result in a course being conditioned by a future Visiting Board.

- 10.3.1 A widespread review of the Part Two programme should be undertaken in collaboration with the new staff joining the Department in early 2007. The review should seek to build on the strengths of the Part One and should not be afraid to address fundamental questions such as:

- the need for and timing of the professional placement;
- the dedicated timetable slot provided for the dissertation;
- the nature and structure of the design projects tackled during the MArch.

The Board is not suggesting that any individual aspect of the Part Two programme needs to be changed, but is concerned that without a willingness to reconsider some of the fundamental building blocks of the MArch, the flexibility to accommodate necessary future improvements will be difficult to achieve.

- 10.3.2 The Board recommends that the Department continue to re-examine its approach to marking, especially at Part One. Several contributory factors result in marks being concentrated in a limited band of the marking range. This results in significantly fewer first class honours degrees than the Board would have expected given the standard of the Department's intake and the quality of the work seen.

- 10.3.3 Once the University has approved its new core assessment regulations, the Department should revisit its assessment regulations with a view to providing greater equity and clarity for students specifically with regard to:
- the provision of lower-level exit awards, such as certificates and diplomas, within the BSc;
 - the opportunities available to students to recover failed units;
 - rewriting the section on "compensation" to make it clear that all graduates were required to satisfy all the RIBA/ARB Validation Criteria.

10.4 **Advice**

The Visiting Board offers the following advice to the Institution on desirable, but not essential improvements, which it is felt would assist course developments and/or raise standards:

- 10.4.1 The Board felt that the consistent scale and duration of projects was a factor contributing to marks being concentrated in a limited band. From year three of the BSc, design projects were all one semester long, involved projects of consistent scale in architectural terms and were expected to be developed to similar levels of resolution. The Board considered that students might be set projects, varied in scale, including shorter projects, that could be developed to examine different aspects of the design process. The Board advises the Department to consider incorporating one project in the degree and the MArch that allows a substantial emphasis on developing the more abstract and conceptual aspects of design, acknowledging that a lower level of architectural/technical resolution might be achieved in this case.
- 10.4.2 The Board advises the Department to continue to develop enhanced support systems for its students in both finding placements and supporting them during their periods of professional experience.
- 10.4.3 The Board advises the Department to participate in the University level discussions that are taking place on ways of developing enhanced linkages between research and teaching
- 10.4.4 The Board welcomed the assurance offered by the Vice Chancellor that resources to the Department should

improve under the University's new finance distribution model. In particular the Board supports the Department's bid for an additional fractional post to ensure that all years of the programmes have a dedicated year co-ordinator.

11. Summary of Previous Visiting Board Reports

- 11.1 The last full Visit to the University of Bath took place on 14 and 15 March 2002.

The Visiting Board recommended:
Continued Validation of

Part One: University of Bath Bachelor of Science with Honours in General Architectural Studies (four year thin sandwich course)

Part Two: University of Bath Master of Architecture (two years full-time and three years part-time)

Conditional Continued Validation of

Part Three: University of Bath Examination in Professional Practice

The following condition was applied to the Part Three course:

- That the Department should submit, within twelve months (i.e., before March 2003), the following information to reassure itself that all the course, leading to the recognised Part Three qualification, was covering the appropriate Criteria for Validation;

- The full course documentation for the Part Three course.
- A full list of external and professional examiners and details of the procedures for the appointment of the examiners.
- A diagram confirming the management structure supporting the course and examination.
- Confirmation that the Department was aware of and working towards the revised RIBA Description and Regulations for the Part Three.

11.2 Response to Condition on Part Three

The Department submitted documentation in response to the condition in March 2003. This was considered by the Validation Advisory Group on 26 March 2003. The Validation Advisory Group requested further information to clarify several outstanding issues and later discharged the condition.

11.3 Summary of the Previous Visiting Board Report

The 2002 Visiting Board report included the following statements:

“The Department’s strengths included a highly committed and supportive staff and a confident student body. The Board found that within the courses, the Department had a great many strengths. The Board recommended that given the resources and expertise within, the Department could develop even greater strengths and standards of excellence.

“The Board found that the BSc (Hons) General Architectural Studies course met the Criteria for Validation at Part One level. The Board noted that the course provided students with a competent and sound experience in architectural design. The Board found

evidence that the non-design elements were demonstrated in the design output to a high standard. The Board noted that the areas of Culture and Context of Architecture, Construction and Architectural Technologies, Communications and Professional Studies and Management were all integral strengths of the course. The Board noted that the structure of the Part One course provided students with a valuable opportunity to gather professional experience at an early stage in their studies. The Board however, recommended that the Department may wish to consider further developing the approach to environmental design and sustainability in the future.

“The Board found that the Master of Architecture (Part Two) course met the Criteria for Validation and the standards of the design work were competent. The Board was pleased to find, as with the Part One course, that the course had a number of strengths. In particular, the Board commended the areas of Culture and Context of Architecture and Professional Studies and Management. The Board noted that the Part Two course was in the process of being reviewed and the Department was examining the possible direction the course might take. The Board noted that in line with the last Visiting Board report, that the demonstration of an understanding of the environmental design in the studio work and portfolios still needs to be improved. The Department is aware of this issue and is seeking to address it and the Board expressed the opinion that this problem needs some further attention.

“The Board was satisfied that the standards achieved in the Part Three examination were appropriate. The Board found that the Department operated a joint venture with the RIBA Wessex Region in terms of the Part Three

course and examination. The Board supports the close links that have been established between the Region and the Department. However, the Board had some concerns regarding the length and content of the course. The Board was also concerned that the roles and responsibilities of each of the parties involved were unclear. As a result the Board recommended that the Department must review the Part Three course/examination and submit further information which addresses the Board's concerns within 12 months."

12. Commentary

12.1 Self-Appraisal and Developments since the Last Visit

The Department's Critical Self-Appraisal was a helpful starting point for the Board's deliberations. It included a comprehensive SWOT analysis compiled as a result of an internal staff consultation exercise. Although students had completed questionnaires which had helped inform the Self-Appraisal, the Board was surprised to find that neither the students nor many members of staff had not seen the final document. The Board was also surprised to receive a separate Critical Self-Appraisal for the Part Three course.

The main developments to the course since the last Visiting Board have been undertaken in response to issues raised by that Board and/or by External Examiners and are summarised in section 12.3 below.

12.2 Documentation and Arrangements for the Visit

The documentation received in advance of the Board covered all the requirements set out in the RIBA Validation Procedures. The Board found it hard to navigate and repetitive, poorly laid out and felt that a more

rigorous editorial approach would have been helpful. Moreover, the documentation failed to do justice to the real strengths of the courses which became apparent when the Board viewed the exhibition and the work in the portfolios. The Board would encourage the Department to do more to celebrate its real strengths, possibly in a form of a year book. The Board was impressed by the 2004 MArch year book, a copy of which was supplied, but understands that this has only been published on the Departmental website for the last two years.

The organisation of the visit by the Department was good. Requests for additional documents and further meetings were dealt with speedily and efficiently.

12.2.1 Record of Academic portfolios sampled

BSc (Hons) General Architectural Studies (Part One)

Year 1: 3 lowest pass, 2 middle and 2 high pass (from a cohort of 68)

Year 2: 3 lowest pass, 2 middle and 2 high pass portfolios (from a cohort of 66)

Year 3: 3 lowest pass, 2 middle and 2 high pass portfolios (from a cohort of 39)

Year 4: 3 lowest pass, 2 middle and 2 high pass portfolios (from a cohort of x)

The year four portfolios included all work from years 2, 3 and 4.

Master of Architecture (Part Two):

Year 1: 3 lowest pass, 2 middle and 2 high pass portfolios (from a cohort of 22)

Year 2: 3 lowest pass, 2 middle pass and 2 high pass portfolios (from a cohort of 25).

The year 2 portfolios included all work from years 1 and 2.

Examination in Professional Practice (Part Three)

For Part Three, the Board examined the complete assessed work of all 9 candidates from the most recent cohort of graduates in 2005. (6 passed). The pass list, mark sheet and examination question papers were only made available after the start of the visit following a specific request. Work from 15 candidates of the 2004 cohort and 5 candidates from the 2003 cohort were also provided, but no records of marks or examination papers were made available.

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

The Department's Critical Self-Appraisal provided a clear account of developments since the last full Visiting Board to the Department in 2002. It identified the following responses to specific issues raised in the Board's report:

- The 2002 Board recommended an expansion of teaching in the areas of environmental design and sustainability. A new member of staff was employed in 2003 to deliver the Environment 2 unit in second year. Two additional appointments have recently been made in this area as part of a major investment in teaching and research activity in the area of sustainability.
- The 2002 report had questioned the appropriateness of assessing structures in the first year entirely by examination. Complimentary coursework assessment has been introduced.
- The 2002 Board recommended better management of the process via which students are supported to find placements. Better support is now provided as the result of the appointment of two in-house Professional Studies Advisors.

- Since the last visit, the assessment of design project work has been modified from the former system where 80% of the mark derived from the final crit to the current system where the full mark is awarded at the portfolio review.
- The 2002 report referred to the need to strengthen environmental design teaching in the MArch. A three-credit unit in Landscape & Ecology was introduced; with the recruitment of a new member of staff in this area, this has been increased to a six- credit unit.
- Management teaching has also been enhanced in Part Two and since 2002, architecture students have studied a new unit in Natural Building methods and Materials alongside civil engineering students.

In conditioning the Part Three course, the 2002 Board raised a number of specific concerns. The Department has responded to these as follows:

- The link with the Wessex Region of the RIBA in the delivery of the Part Three course was terminated in 2002, and the course is now administered by the Department.
- The course document has been fully restructured and revised, setting out in greater detail the content of the course, the syllabus and examination procedures
- The examination of the course is undertaken by a panel of 'External Examiners' appointed by the Department and drawn from a register held by the RIBA, and adjudicated by a 'Senior External Examiner' also appointed by the Department.
- The re-drafted course syllabus, regulations and content have been published electronically
- An internal Departmental Part Three Committee has been established.

The External Examiners, in their meeting with the 2006 Board also confirmed that the Department responded to issues raised in their reports and that they did see changes as a result of their comments.

12.4 Context of the courses within the wider provision of the Department and Faculty

The validated courses are run by Bath University's Department of Architecture and Civil Engineering. The Department is one of four departments making up the University's Faculty of Engineering and Design. The others are Chemical Engineering, Electronic and Electrical Engineering and Mechanical Engineering.

The other undergraduate courses run within the Department of Architecture & Civil Engineering are:

- BEng Civil Engineering
- MEng Civil Engineering
- MEng Civil & Architectural Engineering.

The validated Part One architecture programme shares all teaching in the first semester of year one with the civil engineering programmes. Design studio teaching is also shared in semester two of year three and semester one of year four (the "Basil Spence project".) In semester two of the first year of the MArch degree the module in Natural Building Methods and Materials is shared with the MEng students.

The Department also operates the following postgraduate programmes:

- MSc Façade Engineering
- MSc Construction Management by Distance Learning
- MSc Conservation of Historic Buildings
- MPhil in History & Theory

MPhil in Innovative Structural Engineering
Students on the MArch programme have access to options drawn from the MSc course in Conservation and the MPhil in History & Theory.

12.5 Detailed Commentary on the Part One course

BSc (Hons) General Architectural Studies (four years thin sandwich):

12.5.1 Clarity, validity and achievement of course objectives

The overall aims, educational aims and learning outcomes for the BSc (Hons) General Architectural Studies were set out clearly in the Programme Specification. They were seen to be appropriate and were being achieved. The Department also provided a detailed and helpful mapping of the Part One programme onto the RIBA/ARB Part One Validation Criteria. The Board considered that there was a real coherence to the aims and objectives of the programme and that this was highly visible in the work viewed.

12.5.2 Course design and content

The Part One is offered in a distinctive and unique mode as a four year thin sandwich programme with periods of professional practice in years two and three immediately following the Easter vacation. The course has a strong tradition of students participating in SOCRATES exchanges with seven European partner institutions. These exchanges take place in year three of the four-year programme and can be for one or two semesters. To facilitate this, the Department maps the achievement of the RIBA criteria onto work undertaken in years two and four, but not year three. The Board recognised that the combination of the thin sandwich structure and the opportunities for SOCRATES placements resulted in a

complex course structure. It was clear, however that the structure worked and the standard of fourth year projects in particular clearly benefited from the two periods of professional experience embedded in the degree.

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

- *Design*

The Board was satisfied that all the Validation Criteria in the area of Design were being met by all graduates from the BSc (Hons) General Architectural Studies programme. The Board saw the strengths of the design project work as being the joint projects operated with civil engineering students and the effective integration of technology and environmental issues and cultural context. The Board also commended the reports which students generate to accompany their design submissions; these were seen as well-researched and professionally written. In the third and the final year, the Board saw students tackling three similarly structured and organised projects and wondered whether this provided students with the best opportunities to develop their conceptual thinking. The Board felt that the consistent scale and duration of projects was a factor contributing to marks being concentrated in a limited band. From year three of the BSc, design projects were all one semester long, involved projects of consistent scale in architectural terms and were expected to be developed to similar levels of resolution. The Board considered that students might be set projects, varied in scale, including shorter projects, that could be developed to examine different aspects of the design process. The Board advises the Department to consider incorporating one project in the degree and the MArch that allows a substantial emphasis on developing the more abstract and conceptual

aspects of design, acknowledging that a lower level of architectural/technical resolution might be achieved in this case.

- *Technology & Environment*

The Board was satisfied that all the Validation Criteria in the area of Technology & Environment were being met by all graduates from the BSc (Hons) General Architectural Studies programme. The Part One course includes two formal units of study in each of the areas of structure, construction and environment. These units provide an excellent coverage of the Part One criteria in Technology and Environment. There was clear evidence of the integration of the knowledge acquired from formal study into the various design units offered across the four years of the course. This integration was assisted by the joint design projects with civil engineers undertaken in years one, three and four. The Board saw this area as being one of the strengths of the course.

- *Cultural Context*

The Board was satisfied that all Validation Criteria in the area of Cultural Context were being met by all graduates from the BSc (Hons) General Architectural Studies programme. The Board found an impressive coverage of the criteria in this area through the four formal history and theory modules (two in year one plus one each in years two and four). The Board would support the Department's proposal to reverse the order of the first year modules to allow twentieth century architecture to be considered at the start of the student's studies. The Board also saw clear evidence that a wide range of contextual issues were brought into various studio projects across the Part One.

- *Communication*

The Board was satisfied that all Validation Criteria in the area of Communication were being met by all graduates from the BSc (Hons) General Architectural Studies programme. The Board saw evidence in the portfolios made available of decent hand-drawn and computer-generated drawing. First year work is entirely hand-drawn and some good work was seen at this stage. Given that the majority of the students have no experience of drawing prior to their arrival on the course, students appear to be well-supported in this respect. The CAD1 unit (AR20009) provides a good introduction to the effective use of electronic media and is well-positioned to support students' skills development in this area prior to their first placement. Students also clearly take advantage of the excellent model-making facilities available and some good models were seen, both final and developmental. The written work displayed in the various assignments seen by the Board was excellent. The Part One students who attended the meeting with the board were articulate and capable of engaging in sophisticated discussion. Overall the Board saw an excellent and appropriate emphasis on providing students with the communication skills they were going to need for practice. The Board wondered whether students might also be encouraged to take up the wider opportunities offered by the joint provision with engineering, to use less obvious means of representation and perhaps be encouraged, for example to weld, cast or produce collages.

- *Management Practice & Law*

The Board was satisfied that all the Validation Criteria in the area of Management Practice & Law were being met by all graduates from the BSc (Hons) General Architectural Studies programme. The coverage of the

Part One criteria in this area by the two units Management 1 (AR20052) and Management 2 (AR30053) was admirably thorough. These units were also well located within the course to assist students in acquiring knowledge of the principles of business management, the operation of the construction industry and architectural practice, immediately prior to their two periods of practical experience. The sandwich structure of the course was an obvious strength in helping achieve integration of theory and practice in this area of the syllabus.

- *Preparation for Professional Experience*

The University of Bath specialises in running thin sandwich degree programmes and has systems that are well-g geared to preparing students for placements. In addition to a University Handbook, the Department produces a Student Placement handbook which offers excellent helpful advice to students in preparing for and fully benefiting from the two periods of professional placement. The Department also includes a key management and practice module (Management 1 AR20052) in year two to introduce students to the structure of the construction industry and the roles and responsibilities of the various professions prior to their first placement experience.

Students commented that historically there had been little support for students in finding placements, but there was now much better support following the appointment of a new Professional Studies Advisor. Students reported that, whereas year three students all find placements, year two students had not always done so. However, close to 100% of year two students were also now successful in finding placements given the extra support on offer. The Board commends the Department on the identification of two staff dedicated to supporting students on placements and

advises the Department to continue to develop enhanced support systems for its students in both finding placements and supporting them during their periods of professional experience.

12.5.4 *Progression within the course*

The Department supplied details of progression rates included in the annual programme monitoring reports. The number of students who fail or withdraw is low and falling. Most withdrawals are from year one and the figure has fallen from 10 students in 2001/2 to 9 in 2002/3, 5 in 2003/4, 6 in 2004/5 and 3 in 2005/6. The Department believes the increase in A level entry requirements from 3Bs in 2001/2 to the current 3As has resulted in students more able to cope with the course.

12.5.5 *Assessment*

The Board found a good range of appropriate assessment vehicles in use throughout the BSc, but does have a number of concerns about the marking range employed in design projects in particular and some issues with overarching assessment regulations.

The Board recommends that the Department continue to re-examine its approach to marking, especially at Part One. Several contributory factors result in marks being concentrated in a limited band of the marking range. This results in significantly fewer first class honours degrees than the Board would have expected given the standard of the Department's intake and the quality of the work seen.

The Board was concerned about the absence of "exit awards", such as certificates and diplomas, and the opportunities for students to recover failed units. The Board received appropriate assurances from the Head of

Department that fails would never be condoned in core units, but was concerned to see this qualified by the word "normally" in the assessment regulations for the course. The Board had a meeting with the University's Head of Enhancement and Development to explore these issues. She explained that the University was in the process of generating a common core of assessment regulations in response to a prompt from the recent QAA Institutional Audit. The Board thus advises that, once the University has approved its new core assessment regulations, the Department should revisit its assessment regulations with a view to providing greater equity and clarity for students specifically with regard to:

- the provision of lower-level exit awards, such as certificates and diplomas, within the BSc;
- the opportunities available to students to recover failed modules;
- rewriting the section on "compensation".

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

The target intake for the BSc GAS course in 2005/6 was 52 home students and 12 overseas. 71 were actually enrolled. The target intake has risen from 45-50 in 2002 to its current level of 65 where it is now capped. The Department's formal entry requirements are for three grade As at A level. It is clear from the data supplied by the Department that in the last few years only a handful of applicants have failed to achieve these grades or their equivalent in such other qualifications as the International Baccalaureate. The Department does not allow direct entry into later years of the programme. There is a limited and careful process that permits students on the civil engineering programme who demonstrate real talent in design to transfer at the end of the period of joint teaching

in semester one of year one. The corresponding opportunity exists for architecture students to seek a transfer to civil engineering

12.6 Detailed Commentary on the Part Two course:
Master of Architecture (two years thin-sandwich)

12.6.1 *Clarity, validity and achievement of course objectives*

The Programme Specification document for the MArch provides a clear statement of the educational aims of the programme. The unit descriptions also included clear statements of aims, learning outcomes and assessment strategy for each unit. The Department also provided a detailed and helpful mapping of the Part Two programme onto the RIBA/ARB Part Two Validation Criteria.

12.6.2 *Course design and content*

The Part Two programme operates in a unique thin-sandwich mode with the first semester of the course being spent on a professional placement.

The Board was aware that there had been significant staffing changes in the Department over the last few years and that a review of the Part One programme had been the key priority. The Board now recommends that a widespread review of the Part Two programme should be undertaken in collaboration with the new staff joining the Department in early 2007. The review should seek to build on the strengths of the Part One and not be afraid to address fundamental questions such as:

- the need for and timing of the professional placement;
- the dedicated timetable slot provided for the dissertation;

- the nature and structure of the design projects tackled during the MArch.

The Board is not suggesting that any individual aspect of the Part Two programme needs to be changed, but is concerned that without a willingness to reconsider some of the fundamental building blocks of the MArch, the flexibility to accommodate necessary future improvements will be difficult to achieve.

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

- *Design*

The Board was satisfied that all the Validation Criteria in the area of Design were being met by all of the graduates from the Masters in Architecture. The Board regarded the Part Two design work they saw as competent, but (particularly at the lower end) lacking the "personal thesis/agenda" that might be expected at Part Two level. The Board felt that this might be a function of the reduced amount of time available to Bath students given the professional placement which starts the course and the dedicated period for the dissertation. They thought that a further consequence of this structure was a weakness in the way in which cultural context and technology are critically examined in the design work. Whilst these disciplines are well integrated, the Board did not see the equivalent of the imaginative solutions contained in the best Part One portfolios. The Board also suggested that the best students are not being as fully challenged as they might be. There was, for example a disparity in the intellectual weight of the year one project set in Venice undertaken by 2006 graduates and the equivalent project in 2005/6 based on Bristol Zoo. The Board considered that students might be set projects, varied in scale,

including shorter projects, that could be developed to examine different aspects of the design process. The Board advises the Department to consider incorporating one project in the MArch that allows a substantial emphasis on developing the more abstract and conceptual aspects of design, acknowledging that a lower level of architectural/technical resolution might be achieved in this case.

-Technology & Environment

The Board was satisfied that all Validation Criteria in the area of Technology & Environment were being met by all of the graduates from the Masters in Architecture. Part Two students study a small number of taught modules such as Landscape & Ecology and Natural Building Methods & Materials, but the Department's mapping shows the criteria in this area being primarily met through Design Studio 5.2 and Design Studio 6.2 and particularly the technical reports that accompany the design work. As at Part One, the Board saw clear evidence of technology and environment issues being thoroughly integrated into students' design work. Whilst the work was never less than competent they did not, however, see the same level of imagination regarding technical solutions as had been evident in the best Part One work.

- Cultural Context

The Board was satisfied that all Validation Criteria in the area of Cultural Context were being met by all of the graduates from the Masters in Architecture. Part Two students study three formal units: History & Theory of Architecture 5 (AR40105), and History & Theory of Architecture 6 (AR40209)/ Conservation of Historic Building (AR40210)/Urban Studies (AR40246) plus the dissertation. Together, these provided an impressive,

intellectually challenging framework for students to integrate elements of cultural context into Part Two design project work. Once again, the Board found the extent of integration impressive, although the approaches adopted lacked the imagination of some of the best Part One work. The Board was very impressed with the work undertaken in the specialist optional units available to Part Two students in areas such as Conservation where there was a strong link to the Department's research expertise.

- Communication

The Board was satisfied that all Validation Criteria in the area of Communication were being met by all of the graduates from the Masters in Architecture. The Board saw evidence of students using appropriately a wide range of approaches to representation; there were some particularly effective models. The dissertations were particularly strong displaying impressive research and written with intellectual depth. They were seen as one of the strengths of the course, but the Board believed it might be possible to get better cross-over from the high quality enquiry/research demonstrated in the dissertation to the design projects where representation of background research was sometimes thin. The Part Two students who attended the meeting with the board were extremely articulate and capable of engaging in sophisticated discussion. The one major disappointment for the Board in this area was the rather poor organisation and construction of some of the Part Two portfolios they were presented with. The Board saw many examples of poorly photographed models. The Board appreciated having a record of models constructed, but hopes that students might in future be encouraged to use photography creatively as a contribution to process or presentation.

- *Management Practice & Law*

The Board was satisfied that all the Validation Criteria in the area of Management Practice & Law were being met by all of the graduates from the Masters in Architecture. The Board saw this as being one of the strengths of the course. The two management units AR40101 (Management 5) and AR40110 (Management 6) not only provided a complete coverage of the Part Two criteria in this area, but also covered significant aspects of the Part Three criteria. There was also clear evidence that students were required to engage with legal and statutory issues in their final design projects.

12.6.5 *Progression within the course*

Very few students withdraw or fail. At most the number not progressing is one or two a year; some years the pass rate has been 100%.

12.6.6 *Assessment*

A number of concerns regarding the Department's assessment regulations are set out in 12.5.6 above. Although these primarily concern Part One, a number of issues also impact on Part Two, for example retrieval of failure and compensation.

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

The intake to the Part Two programme in 2005/6 was 22 of which 15 were Bath graduates. An upper second class honours degree is required. There is no entry with advanced standing. Staff made it clear that they were committed to keeping intake to the programme relatively low to retain the close links between staff and students that characterise the experience. The Board encouraged the Department in its forthcoming review of the Part Two

to consider some expansion of numbers, to ensure the long term sustainability of the course. The Board was confident that the distinctive features of the Part Two could be proactively marketed to graduates from other institutions.

12.7 Detailed Commentary on the Part Three course:
Examination in Professional Practice

12.7.1 A number of changes had been made to the Part Three course since the 2002 Visiting Board to respond to concerns the Board had raised in their report. The link with the Wessex Region of the RIBA had been terminated in 2002 and the course was now solely the responsibility of the Department. The Course Document had been completely rewritten and significantly expanded. The examination process was undertaken by a panel of "External Examiners" appointed by the Department and drawn from the RIBA list of Professional Examiners. The assessment process was overseen by a "Senior External Examiner" also appointed by the Department. The course syllabus, regulations and course content have been made available electronically to candidates.

12.7.2 In the documentation provided for the Board, the Department explained that the course was presently being approved by the University for the award of a 30 credit Postgraduate Certificate of Professional Practice. The Board sought clarification from the University's Head of Enhancement and Development as to the precise status of the course. She explained that at the time of the visit the Part Three programme was not a university award, but was administered by the Department. In administering

-
- the course, the Department seeks to shadow established University QA procedures e.g. for external examiners.
- 12.7.3 The Head of Enhancement and Development provided the Board with detail on the University's process for validating new courses. The Department's new course proposal was at initial approval stage where its financial viability and strategic fit was being scrutinised. On completion of this stage, it will proceed to full approval where academic content and level will be scrutinised in a process of peer review involving academics from outside the Department and outside the University. If this process goes smoothly full approval could be gained by the end of semester two of the 2006/7 academic year.
- 12.7.4 The Board was provided with the current Course Handbook, a mapping of the course onto the RIBA Part Three Validation Criteria, plus a full set of course materials. The Board also received details of the proposed Postgraduate certificate in Professional Practice. The current Course Handbook was rather terse, but included all essential information. The documentation for the new programme included, in addition, unit descriptions with aims and learning outcomes.
- 12.7.5 The Department currently uses the term "External Examiner" to describe the role set out in the RIBA Part Three Description and Regulations as "Professional Examiner" and the term "Senior External Examiner" to describe the "External Examiner" role. In developing its new course proposal, the Board hopes the Department will come into line and adopt terminology consistent with other schools of architecture.
- 12.7.6 The Part Three mapping document supplied by the Department clearly demonstrated how the RIBA/ARB Part Three Validation Criteria were covered by the taught course and assessed by one or more elements of the course assessment. On the basis of this and a detailed examination of the candidate work provided (which exceeded the minimum required), the Board confirms that all Part Three Validation Criteria are being met by all graduates from the Part Three programme.
- 12.7.7 The Board was aware that a new course director had been appointed in 2005 and that this had inevitably resulted in some lack of continuity. The Board was, however, surprised that mark sheets for the 2005 cohort had not routinely been made available and that no Part Three candidates or graduates had been invited to return to the Department to meet the Board. The Senior External Examiner for the Part Three did, however report that he found the examinations to be well organised, and well-managed.
- 12.7.8 The Board explored in discussion with the Senior External Examiner the comparability of standards with other courses. The External Examiner (Senior External Examiner in the Department's terminology), who held External Examiner appointments at two other schools of architecture confirmed that standards set by the Bath course were high. The professional interview was clearly also being conducted in an appropriately rigorous fashion with the External Examiner able to confirm consistency between the approach adopted and decision reached by the different pairs of Professional Examiners.
- 12.7.9 Overall the Board was satisfied that the work of the 2005 cohort clearly demonstrated that the Part Three Validation

Criteria were being met by all graduates from the course and that minimum pass standards were being set appropriately. However in order to have confidence that this would continue to be the case the Board requires that the course be fully validated by the University and approved by the RIBA New Courses & Course Changes Group before any promotion is undertaken for, or candidates are registered on, the next (2007/8) cohort of programme. This is to ensure that there is full compliance with university regulations on external examining, that university appeals procedures are available to candidates and that the course benefits from formal university annual monitoring and periodic review procedures.

The Board thus imposed a condition on the course as follows:

The Department must:

- achieve internal validation for the programme
- gain approval for the revised programme from the RIBA New Courses & Course Changes Group before any promotion is undertaken for, or candidates are registered on, the next (2007/8) cohort of programme. A revisit will be undertaken by a sub-group of the Board when the work of the first cohort of the university validated programme is available to establish that the Part Three validation criteria continue to be met and that appropriate pass standards are being maintained.

12.8 External examining arrangements

The Board was able to meet 3 of the current 4 External Examiners for the Part One and Part Two programmes and also had a separate meeting with the external examiner for the Part Three course. The Board supported the decision made some years ago by the Department to

appoint external examiners who were involved with both Part One and Part Two. The three External Examiners for the Part One and Part Two who were available to meet the Board were (or had been) heads of other schools of architecture and all had extensive experience of examining at other schools. The Board recognised that this made for a strong team, but were a little concerned about the balance of the external examining team given that the one full-time practitioner examiner had not participated fully in the 2006 assessment boards and was also unable to meet the Board. The Department reassured the Board that they expect this External Examiner to participate fully in the 2006/7 assessments. The Board was also satisfied as to the University's regulations governing external examining.

The documents supplied to the Board in advance of the visit demonstrated that the External Examiners provided the University with thorough and detailed reports and that they received a response to them from the Department. In their meeting with the Board, the External Examiners were very supportive of the Department and its courses. They confirmed that they were completely satisfied with the opportunities they were given to engage with the Department's assessment process which they found to be open and straightforward. They also confirmed that they had been given a thorough induction. The Department also responded promptly and appropriately to issues that they raised in their reports.

In the meeting with the "Senior External Examiner" for the Part Three programme, the Board established that his was an entirely appropriate appointment and that he was able to bring substantial appropriate experience to his role both as an experienced practitioner and as External

Examiner to Part Three courses at two other schools of architecture.

12.9 **Arrangements for Monitoring Professional Experience**

The Department produces a detailed and helpful Student Placement Handbook. This provides much useful background for students preparing for and undertaking both periods of professional experience built into Part One and that at the start of the Part Two programme. The Handbook includes examples of the various forms the Department expects the student and the workplace supervisor to complete. There is an interim form to be completed at the six weeks period to pick up any problems and a final form to be completed upon conclusion of the placement. The Board was provided with completed forms for a whole cohort of students and it was clear that the discipline of completing and returning the forms was well embedded and well supported by the Professional Studies Advisors.

12.10 **Students**

The Board was disappointed that, although student questionnaires had helped inform the content of the Department's Critical Self-Appraisal, student representatives had not seen the finished document or had the opportunity to contribute directly to it. The Visiting Board met representatives of all years of the Part One and Part Two programmes. 46 students in all attended. The Board was pleased to have the opportunity to talk to students who had returned from their placements for the meeting, but were disappointed that no Part Three candidates or graduates attended. The meeting was exceptionally lively and well-informed. The Board found

the students to be highly motivated and very committed to the Department. Whilst the students were clearly very proud of the Department, they were also very willing to engage in constructive criticism

Students identified the strengths of the Department as being:

- The distinctive thin sandwich pattern of the courses and the opportunities it provided to gain professional experience alongside academic learning.
- The earning potential provided by the thin sandwich placements
- The strong studio culture throughout the courses.
- The integration with the civil engineering courses and the joint teaching and projects.
- The opportunities to undertake study in one of the Department's partner European institutions through the SOCRATES project. Those students who remain in Bath benefit from the European exchange students they work with in the third year.
- The substantial contribution made to teaching in the Department by practitioners.
- The city of Bath as a location for studying architecture.
- The excellent workshop facilities provided by the Department.
- The fact that the Department provided 24 hour access to the studios.
- The wireless networking throughout the studios and other areas of the campus that allows students to use their lap-tops.
- Staff were very approachable and supportive; although students are assigned personal tutors they could raise issues with studio tutors, year tutors, the course tutor or whoever they felt comfortable talking to.

- The Department was serious about securing students' views through feedback forms etc.; students got responses to their feedback and saw action follow.
- The strong research culture of the Department although this only really impacted on teaching in Part Two – particularly the specialist options offered.

Amongst the concerns raised by students were:

- Although generally positive about the service provided by the Library, students felt that there was a shortage of recently published books. The majority of students were also unaware that they could recommend texts for purchase.
- Some Part Two students wondered about the appropriateness of the placement which started the course; did they gain anything from this given the two placement periods in the Part One and the ARB/RIBA requirement of 12 months' placement upon completion of Part Two?
- Part Two students joining from other schools felt disconnected from the rest of the Department, possibly because of the course starting with a placement period and the resulting arrival in the University in January.
- Part Two students reported that there had been a lack of feedback on some assessments
- Some problems arose through failure of communication between full-time and part-time staff.

12.11 Staff

The Board had an open and lively meeting with 22 members of staff from the Department, both full-time and part-time, but was disappointed that (possibly through a misunderstanding) contracted one-day-a-week tutors did not attend. The Board did, however appreciate the

substantial attendance by staff from the engineering area of the Department and by senior administrators from both the Department and the University. The Board found a cohesive and energetic staff team which included a substantial number of active practitioners. The Board noted that the Department had recently strengthened the staff team with additional appointments and that two impressive new recruits would be arriving early in 2007. Some members of staff reported that they had not seen the Department's Critical Self-Appraisal in its final form.

The Department deliberately makes use of a substantial number of fractional and part-time staff. This policy has strong support from the Department's students for the close access it affords them to active practitioners. The Department recognises that such a staff balance poses issues of staff management and development and has a number of mechanisms in place to deal with this. Overall the Board felt that the systems in place to ensure communication between staff were working, but felt that they were not particularly robust. The Board thus welcomed the assurance offered by the Vice Chancellor that resources to the Department should improve under the University's new finance distribution model. In particular the Board supports the Department's bid for an additional fractional post to ensure that all years of the programmes have a dedicated year co-ordinator.

When fractional and hourly paid are taken into account, the Department's student/staff ratio (calculated using the algorithm recommended by the RIBA) was 16.32:1 at the time of the visit

12.12 **Research:**

It was clear to the Board from the meeting with the Vice Chancellor that the University had a strong commitment to research and that a repetition in 2008 of the Grade 5 achieved by the Department in its submission to Unit of Assessment 33, Built Environment, in the 2001 RAE was a key priority. Research in the Department is focused on two long-standing research centres:

- CASA (the Centre for Advanced Studies in Architecture) principally concerned with the integration of architectural history and computer modelling.
- CSAE (the Centre for Structural and Architectural Engineering) with its interest in modern lightweight structures, innovative structural systems, composite materials, and novel approaches to conservation.

The Department is also the host to a newly established joint venture with the Building Research Establishment – the BRE Centre for Innovative Materials and CWCT- the industry-funded Centre for Window and Cladding Technology. The Board learned that a new Centre for Sustainable Design was in the process of being established, but that it might be located away from the Department. The Board felt that this would be unfortunate as it might potentially limit interaction between the work of the new centre and the rest of the Department.

It was clear to the Board that its research activities were one of the real strengths of the Department and that they were being supported by the University with appropriate strategies and funding streams. The Board considered that the Department’s view that the research activities made a substantial impact on teaching was somewhat overstated.

The Board thus advises the Department to participate in the University-level discussions that are taking place on ways of developing enhanced linkages between research and teaching.

The Board recognised the prestige within the University of being associated with research and noted that there was real interest amongst teaching fellows and part-time staff in developing research strands linked to their teaching and practice. The Board, mindful that there were funding streams for such research from HEFCE, CEBE, SEDA and the RIBA to support staff wishing to establish pedagogic and practice based research, felt that this interest should be nurtured by the Department. The Board does so on the understanding that research of this nature is likely to be embraced by the next RAE round.

12.13 **Equal Opportunities**

The University of Bath has a clear Equal Opportunities Policy and undertakes appropriate monitoring to demonstrate adherence to the Policy. The Department’s admissions policy is operated in a way that is “blind” to ethnicity and sex, but being very successful at operating within a clearly defined recruitment market (3 As at A level) inevitably results in a certain homogeneity in the student population. Where the Department does have discretion in respect of students who have marginally missed their required grades, the Department operates a process which seeks to promote diversity by taking candidates from schools with the lowest A level averages.

The Department has been actively considering the SENDA recommendations regarding built environment disciplines; a redesign of the curriculum is underway to

remove Type 1 (unwitting) and Type 2 (significant) barriers.

Recruitment of staff is undertaken within the clear guidelines of the University's Department of Human Resources. Whilst academic staff are recruited solely on academic merit, when studio staff are recruited there is a conscious effort to secure a gender and ethnic balance.

12.14 **Resourcing and Facilities:**

- *General*

All the architecture courses are delivered using accommodation in adjacent buildings 4E and 6E of the University's main Claverton Campus. The accommodation is primarily that designed for the department although expansion in numbers has resulted in some studio space being provided in the adjacent building. The accommodation is still highly appropriate for the Department's operation with staff offices generally in close proximity to studios. Overall the Board gained the impression of a well-resourced Department.

- *Studios*

Studio space in the Department is under pressure with some increase in Part One numbers, but overall the Board felt that studio spaces were broadly adequate. Students reported that they particularly valued the 24 hour access provided. The guaranteed provision of halls of residence rooms on campus for year one students helped to create a lively studio culture which continued through the programme. Part Two students were content with the space made available for their use, but felt somewhat disconnected from the undergraduates.

- *IT*

The Department has two dedicated computer studios with 40Pcs, scanning and printing facilities. When not in use for group teaching or project work they are available for individual student use. The machines run the latest versions of CAD and SketchUp for 3D modelling. Support is provided by the Department's dedicated IT support officer. In addition, the University Library and Learning Centre houses 450 PCs with 24 hour access during term-time. These machines provide access to the various Microsoft Office software packages and internet access. The Department reports that the majority of the students have their own lap top which they can connect to the University network via the wireless network in all the studio spaces or via the connections provided in all hall of residence rooms. Apart from pressure on printing facilities immediately prior to project submission dates, students reported satisfaction with the IT systems provided by the Department and University.

- *Workshops and Laboratories*

The main facility used by architecture students is the woodworking workshop. This spacious area houses a good selection of machine and handtools. Once an induction course has been completed satisfactorily, students have the use of the majority of the facilities available. The Board saw the impact of this in some excellent model-making throughout the course. Other facilities, primarily for civil engineering students, but available to those on the architecture programme include laboratories for work on concrete, soils, building materials, structures, acoustics and a lighting lab. The Board found these facilities very impressive indeed, but learned that they were little used by students on architecture courses. The Board felt that architecture students might be

encouraged to make more use, particularly of the concrete, soils and materials labs, which were well equipped to allow students to experiment and explore technical aspects of their design projects.

- Library

The University's Library and Learning Resources Centre occupies a central position on campus just two to three minutes walk from the architecture building. The library is open 24 hours a day during term time. In addition to books and journals, the Library provides PCs and lap-top docking points and is wireless networked throughout. In addition to individual study spaces, group working areas are provided.

Each Department of the University is assigned a member of the professional library staff to act as specialist subject librarian to liaise with the member of academic staff nominated as library representative and attend relevant departmental meetings. The specialist subject librarian provides an initial induction for all new students and additional training sessions as required, particularly to support work on dissertations. An introductory library tour is available to students to download to their mp3 player.

The Board found a wide-ranging collection of relevant books and impressive internationally based journal holdings. For the 2006/7 academic year the library allocation for Architecture & Civil Engineering was reported as £63,772. This figure included subscriptions, and inter-library loan charges. The figure for books alone was almost £17,000. This was reported as being adequate to allow the purchase of all new texts recommended by staff and students in the Department. In their meeting

with the Board, students reported general satisfaction with the services provided by the Library, but felt that there was a shortage of up-to-date books. The majority of students were clearly unaware that any recommendation they made would result in purchases. The Board suggests that staff also ensure that regular recommendations for the purchase of recent texts are made.

13. Documentation Supplied

- 13.1 Prior to the visit, the Board was provided by the Department with the Critical Self-Appraisal, Questionnaire and Further Information in 5 volumes
- Vol. 1:
 - Critical Self Appraisal for Part One and Part Two programmes
 - Critical Self Appraisal for Part Three course in Professional Practice
 - University Structure & Management Information
 - Course Details
 - Admissions Policies
 - Staffing details
 - Supplementary Information
 - Departmental Structure
 - Research Activities
 - Links with the Profession
 - Details of studio, workshop and laboratory provision
 - Information resources
 - Financial Resources
 - Arrangements for SOCRATES exchanges
 - Details of Students Placement Employment
 - Postgraduate Research Students
 - Student Entry Qualification
 - Staff CVs

- Vol. 2:
 - BSc (Hons) in General Architectural Studies: Validation Criteria mapping, Programme specifications and unit descriptions.
 - Masters in Architecture: Validation Criteria mapping, Programme specifications and unit descriptions.
 - Programme Handbook for BSc in General Architectural Studies and Masters in Architecture.
 - Student Placement Handbook
- Vol. 3:
 - 2005/6 External Examiners Reports for BSc (GAS) and MArch programmes
 - 2004/5 External Examiners Reports for BSc (GAS) and MArch programmes plus Departmental responses
 - 2003/4 External Examiners Reports for BSc (GAS) and MArch programmes plus Departmental responses
 - 2002/3 External Examiners Reports for BSc (GAS) and MArch programmes plus Departmental responses
 - 2001/2 External Examiners Reports for BSc (GAS) and MArch programmes plus Departmental responses
 - External Examiners CVs.
- Vol. 4
 - Degree Schemes Reviews for BSc (GAS) and MArch, April 2006 and Autumn 2003
 - Proposed changes to the MArch programme approved for 2006/7
 - Documents from Unit/Programme review day 2006
 - Documents from Unit Review day 2005
 - Director of Studies Annual Reports 1999/2000 to 2004/5
 - HEFCE Quality Assessment Report for Architecture at the University of Bath 1994

- Departmental Annual Planning Documents
- University Corporate Plan 2003/4 to 2005/6

- Vol. 5: Examination in Professional Practice Part Three containing:
 - External Examiners reports 2003, 2004 and 2005
 - External Examiners CVs
 - Draft Document for proposed new University of Bath Postgraduate Certificate in Professional Practice
 - Minutes for Part Three Course Committee meetings
 - Part Three Course Handbook
 - Mapping of the Part Three course onto the RIBA Validation Criteria
 - Course Materials

13.2 Board members had access to the following additional information in their base room or the room containing the portfolios:

- Unit boxes for all units of the Part One and Part Two courses including placement periods containing unit descriptions, teaching materials, work samples etc.
- Design project briefs for Part One and Part Two
- Full Part One and Part Two mark sheets for 2005/6 academic year
- Student Critical Self-Appraisal Questionnaires
- Timetable for 2005/6 academic year
- Detailed timetable for the week of the Board
- Notes of Examiners Meetings for Architecture Unit Boards and Supplementary Boards
- University undergraduate prospectus
- University international student handbook
- University placement handbook
- Bath University Architecture Masters Yearbook 2004

- 13.3 The Board was supplied with the following additional documentation during the Board:
- University of Bath QAA Institutional Audit October 2003
 - Briefing note and examples of student information sheets from University Library
 - Mark sheet for 2005 cohort of Part Three programme
 - University Academic Regulations
- 13.4 Board members also had access to a networked PC allowing access to a wide range of additional Department and University documentation.