

RIBA 

Royal Institute of British Architects

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

Confirmed by RIBA Education Committee 26 November 2008

**The College of Art Science & Engineering
School of Architecture**

**Part One: Bachelor of Architecture
Part Two: Master of Architecture**

Date of Visiting Board: 22-23 May 2008

1. Information About the Courses

- 1.1 **Courses offered for revalidation:**
Bachelor of Architecture Part 1
3 years Full Time
Master of Architecture Part 2
2years Full Time
PGDip.Arch Part 2
2 years Full Time
- 1.2 **Address of the Institution where the courses are delivered**
- College of Art, Science & Engineering
School of Architecture
University of Dundee
Matthew Building
13 Perth Road
DD1 4HT
- T: 01382-345315
F: 01382-203631
W: university@dundee.ac.uk
- 1.2 **Name of Awarding Body**
- University of Dundee
- 1.3 **Name of Dean of School**
- Graeme Hutton

2. Membership of the Visiting Board

- 2.1 The members of the RIBA Visiting Board for the visit on 22nd-23rd May 2008 were:
- Derek Cottrell (Chair)
Judi Farren- Bradley (Vice Chair)
Layton Reid
Jillian Jones
Arnie Dunn (Regional Nominee)
Ben Barr (Co-professional Member)
Mark Physsas (Graduate/Student Member)
- Stephanie Beasley Suffolk and Sarah Bedding (RIBA) were in attendance as joint Secretaries to the Board.
- David Gloster (RIBA Director of Education) was in attendance as an observer
- Lynn Alexander attended non-private sessions as a university facilitator.

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. For more information see 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 Continued Validation of:
Bachelor of Architecture Part 1
3 years Full Time
Master of Architecture Part 2
2 years Full Time
PGDip.Arch Part 2
2 years Full 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 Since the previous Visiting Board in 2004, the University has undergone a restructuring exercise. In 2006 the seven existing faculties were merged into four larger colleges. The School of Architecture now sits within the College of Art, Science and Engineering (CASE). The School of Architecture took the decision to become one of the newly independent schools within the revised school structure. The School feels it has benefited from being able to determine and maintain its future direction within the University structure.
- 10.2 The School's strengths include:
- a committed and caring staff team
 - excellent studio facilities which help maintain a lively studio culture
 - an excellent library close to the studios
 - An emphasis on embedding management and practice
- 10.3 Recommendations
The Visiting Board 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

- 10.3.1 The Board recommends the School review the structure and delivery of the MArch to ensure improved integration of technology and to raise the level of ambition and variety of studio design projects. The Board supports the increased diversity between units but recommends the School considers a more holistic and integrated approach to the management of, and interrelationship between, units at Year 4 and 5 to obviate the possibility of significant inconsistencies between the experience of individual students.
- 10.3.2 The Board recommends that the School ensures that the RIBA criteria are firmly embedded in the 5th year of the MArch. On the basis of the evidence provided, the Board considered that students only achieved full compliance with all of Part Two criteria at the end of Year 5. The Board considered embedding the criteria at 5th year would be an opportunity for students to meet the requirements of the profession whilst raising standards and maximising the potential of the new integrated Masters.
- 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;

- 10.4.2 The Board appreciated all the changes that had taken place at institutional and school level but were concerned that there was a potential blunting of aspiration at Year 3 through lack of variation in projects, compared with that at Year 1 and 2. The Board applauds the improvements at Part One as a whole but advises the School to avoid steering towards a culture limited by the need for compliance with the part one criteria in the final year of the Bachelor of Architecture.
- 10.4.3 The Board advises that the School take time to review the delivery of the Masters and to reconsider plans on vertical studios when the structure of the Part Two is resolved.
- 10.4.4 The School may wish to consider, in the short term, reducing the number of thematic studios at Part Two to ensure fewer, stronger studios and relieve pressure on staff.
- 10.4.5 The Board advises that the School review the relationship between the awarding of the M Arch and the awarding of the Dip Arch and whether this University regulation appropriately reflects that the threshold standard is common to both awards.
- 10.4.6 The Board considered there to be good integration of ICT in the studio culture but advised the School to address the Health and Safety issues regarding the use of laptops by students. Adequate furniture and lighting should be provided.

11. Summary of Previous Visiting Board Reports

- 11.1 The last RIBA Visiting Board to the University of Dundee took place on the 25/26 March 2004. The Board recommended that Conditional Continued Validation be granted to:

Bachelor of Architecture Part 1
3 years Full Time
Masters of Architecture Part 2
2 years Full Time

- 11.2 The 2004 Visiting Board commented:

“At the time of the visit, the School was in the process of substantial change. Validated courses were being restructured to fit within a University modularised and semesterised framework. The School had also made a number of staff changes in the previous 18 months including the appointment of a new Head and a new Professor. There was clear evidence in a report supplied to the Board entitled “The Context for Change” that the staff were actively considering the future of architectural education. The paper outlined some imaginative and thoughtful proposals for further change which the Board supported.

Although the Board's recommendations were for Conditional Continued Validation for Parts One and Part Two, there was much to commend in both programmes. The Board recommended that these conditions be imposed at Part One because it had significant concerns regarding both the lowest pass standards being set by the University at Part One level in summer 2003 and the procedures via which decisions regarding compensation

had been made for the graduating cohort. It was clear that the decision to pass students on the basis of compensation (without formal compensation regulations), had overridden the decision of a properly constituted examination board and resulted in students being awarded the Part One who had not satisfied all validation criteria.

The Board had no option other than to make a recommendation for Conditional Continued Validation in respect of the Part Two, because the three lowest pass portfolios had not been made available. The Board was confident that the School, given its underlying strengths, could address both concerns in advance of a revisit following the summer 2004 assessment boards.

The School's strengths include:

- a committed and caring staff team;
- excellent studio facilities which helped create a healthy and active studio culture;
- an excellent broad-based library close to the studios;
- a real commitment to integrating taught materials with design studio work;
- strong links with the community and the local profession, evidenced by the number of student projects that engage with real clients;
- a lively student community and a strong student society (ADAS).

Revisiting Board September 2004

The Revisiting Board took place on 16 September 2004. The Revisiting Board recommended:

Continued Validation of:

Part One: Dundee University Bachelor of Science (Architecture), three years full-time

Part Two: Dundee University Bachelor of Architecture with Honours, two years full-time

13. Commentary

13.1 Self-Appraisal and Developments since the last visit

In its Critical Self Appraisal the School provided a commentary on its actions in response to the 2004 Visiting Board.

- The School of Architecture has undergone significant structural change since the Visiting Board in 2004. The Honours final award has now evolved into an integrated Masters Degree final award.
- The School confirmed they are providing greater guidance through its Communications programme. Student's portfolios are now formally assessed. This is linked to the implementation of the PDP scheme which the School is seeking to integrate with the PEDR record.
- The School has responded to recommendations regarding the complexity of design ambitions in Part Two. Part Two students in year 4 are now required to produce a complete integrated design of a sophisticated building in a project linked to a Design Research Unit. In the DRU students undertake a related, but separate piece of research/exploration which then forms the basis of the year five design research thesis.
- The School responded to advice from the previous Visiting Board regarding the amount of substantial pieces

of written work in Part One. Year 3 students now participate in a year long lecture series and are required to undertake two pieces of written work of 1,200 words and 3,000 words.

The School's Self Appraisal was candid and appropriately critical. The changes to the course structure, and the new college structure has influenced the character of the school. The physical reorganisation of the studios and the changes to the MArch have impacted positively on the quality of the student experience and extended the reach of the award programme. The School of Architecture has a new place within the college and is exploring new linkages with other subject areas within the college.

13.2 **Documentation and Arrangements for the Visit**

The documentation provided for the board in advance of the visit was clear and succinct. The documentation provided for the Board in the Base room was in the main complete and accessible. The Exhibition of the students work was excellent and very helpful to The Board in showing the progression of the course. The portfolios were easy to navigate, especially in Part One, although the room provided to interrogate the portfolios was not large enough for the amount of work on display. The Board applauded the use of models in the Exhibition work. The overall programme of the visit worked smoothly and the Board appreciated the support and help provided by the Institutional Facilitator.

13.2.1 *Record of Academic Portfolios sampled during the visit*

The Board saw complete academic portfolios drawn from 2007/2008 academic year as follows:

Bachelor of Architecture

Year One: 3 lowest pass, two middle pass and two high Pass (from a cohort of 75)

Year Two: 3 lowest pass, two middle pass and two high pass (from a cohort of 65)

Year Three: 3 lowest pass, two middle pass and two high pass (from a cohort of 65)

Masters in Architecture

Year Four: 3 lowest, two middle and two high (from a cohort of 61)

Year Five: 5 lowest, two middle and two high (from a cohort of 64)

No sample portfolios were available for the Diploma in Architecture exit award.

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

The School's Self Appraisal provided a commentary on changes since the last Visiting Board in 2004. This included changes made in response to issues flagged in the Board's report. The School have addressed some concerns over the level of design ambition within the course and the Board was pleased to note that the External Examiners who met with them during their visit considered that this had increased over the years. The Board thought this was particularly evident at Part One. The Board also noted that students on the Masters course will have produced in aggregate a large amount of written work by the point of graduation and the Board felt the School had therefore addressed the level of written work undertaken by students. The Board considered that the School should keep this under review in the light of recent

staff appointments to ensure a balance between written and design work is maintained.

13.4 **Context of the courses within the wider provision of the school and College.**

The new college structure with the University has resulted in the School of Architecture benefiting from a financial independence and budgetary transparency. This new autonomy brings with it new challenges to the School, including identifying new income streams and research funding. The Board hopes the School continues their positive links with the Art and Design School, including the sharing of facilities and the exploration and development of possible synergies. The Board is also supportive of the potential for new linkages with other schools within the College and believes the School should explore these opportunities.

13.5 **Detailed Commentary on the Course leading to Part One qualification (Bachelor of Architecture)**

13.5.1 Clarity, validity and achievement of course objectives

The Board felt that the Course objectives were both clear and valid, allowing students to meet the required learning outcomes.

13.5.2 Course design and content

There is a clear thread of development ideas and progress through years One to Three in Part One. The Board was particularly impressed with the quality of teaching and level of achievement, especially at Year One and Two.

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

- Design

On the basis of the sample of academic portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Bachelor of Architecture programme are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of design. The Board found that there was a variety and a high level of ambition in years one and two. The Board was impressed by the interesting projects at a variety of scales, and the combinations of individual and team work across Part One, but particularly in the exploration of place.

- Technology & Environment

On the basis of the sample of academic portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Bachelor of Architecture programme are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Technology and Environment. The School needs to retain vigilance that Technology is fully integrated. The School could give consideration to collaborations with specialists; students may benefit from input from co-professionals drawn from other parts of the design team.

- Cultural Context

On the basis of the sample of academic portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Bachelor of Architecture programme are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Cultural Context. There could be a broader appreciation of a number of themes, in particular the relationship to sustainability and the emphasis on issues of social sustainability could be increased.

- Communication

On the basis of the sample of academic portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Bachelor of Architecture programme are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Communication. The Board was impressed with the variety of methods of

communication that were being explored, including life drawing models, photography and especially the full size installations. The Board felt the oral communication was particularly coherent. The Board considered that the introduction to CAD in year 1 was exemplary.

- Management Practice & Law

On the basis of the sample of academic portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Bachelor of Architecture programme are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Management Practice and Law. The Board wishes to commend the school's approach to Management Practice and Law and in particular the support provided by the Practical Training Adviser. The Board felt that a strength of the School was its mindfulness to embed the themes of professional practice from the start, most notably by ensuring students work in practice within the first term.

- Preparation for Professional Experience, (Part 1 only)

The Board noted that the 3 months in practice elements operated by the School was in fact limited to a minority of students. However, this scheme is beneficial to mature students and the School would do well to promote this. The Board considered that the short periods working in practice may not be suitable to all students and most would benefit from longer periods of practice. The Board considered that this should not act as a replacement to the year out.

13.5.4 - Progression within the course

The student cohort analysis shows the School to be achieving excellent overall completion rates for the Part One. The students are provided with a PDP from Year 1.

13.5.5 - Assessment:

Assessment methods were clear and appropriate to the task. Students are encouraged to self assess. PDPs are

introduced from Year One when students are given self assessment crits. ARB self critical assessment sheets are introduced at the end of Year Three.

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

The Board was impressed with the arrangements made for the admissions at Part One. The School is to be applauded for interviewing all applicants, including overseas students, and insisting on a portfolio. All candidates wishing for direct entry other than at Level 1 are interviewed with portfolio before acceptance onto the programme. Work presented at the interview is evaluated in accordance with the University's APL procedures.

13.6 Detailed Commentary on the Course leading to Part Two qualification

13.6.1 Clarity, validity and achievement of course objectives

The Board felt the course objectives were clear and valid. The Board believed that the students at the lower and middle ends of the course would benefit from tighter structuring of course Objectives in the 5th year. At the lower level, the Board considered that students are potentially compromised because they had not been exposed to a more independent way of working earlier on in the course.

13.6.2 Course design and content

The Board believed that Years 4 and 5 were full of aspiration and had great potential. However the Board considered that the School should avoid emphasis on the Validation Criteria in the learning outcomes in order to avoid a mechanistic compliance culture. The Board believed that the Compliance Sheet in Year 4 was not the optimum way of assessing students, whilst self reflection is

a useful tool, at this level such assessment should be by tutors. It might be useful for the School to explore the possibility of the PGDip award being used as a different way for students to learn and study, rather than a compensatory award should they not gain their Masters.

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

- Design

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board confirms that all graduates of the Masters of Architecture have met Part Two criteria in the area of design. The Board considered that at Level Four there was a good coverage of the syllabus, however at Level Five the level of ambition and complexity and scale of projects needed review. The Board felt there could be more documentation of all the design processes by the students.

- Technology & Environment

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board confirms that all graduates of the Masters of Architecture programme met all Part Two criteria in the area of Technology and Environment. The Board considered that there needed to be a broader consideration of technology and applied integration of technology in projects in both Level Four and Five. The Board was pleased to note the appointment of a sustainability specialist and looked forward to their contribution in the future.

- Cultural Context

On the basis of the sample of academic portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Masters in Architecture programme are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Cultural Context. As

with Part One, there could be a broader appreciation of a number of themes. In particular in relation to sustainability, the emphasis on issues of social sustainability in particular could be increased.

- Communication

On the basis of the sample of academic portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Masters in Architecture programme are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Communication. The Board is confident that the improved Communication at Part One will feed into Part Two. There was already some good work in this area, and students seemed to have benefitted from the upgraded computers in the School.

- Management Practice & Law

On the basis of the sample of academic portfolios examined the Visiting Board confirms that all graduates from the Masters in Architecture programme are meeting the Validation Criteria in the area of Management Practise and Law. The Board felt that their positive approach to this area was a strength of the School at both Part One and Two.

13.6.4 Progression within the course

Retention and completion rates at Part Two were good. However, the School may wish to look again at the use of the PGDip award, the Board was concerned that this may be perceived as a sanction for those students who did not gain the Masters.

13.6.5 Assessment

The Board felt that students would benefit from clarification of assessment feedback. The School should ensure that appropriate mechanisms are in place for

feedback to enable student progression. The Board considered the School could usefully revise the use of compliance documents, and initiate an ongoing review of threshold standards to ensure all students continue to meet the criteria at Part Two.

- 13.6.6 Admissions and arrangements for direct entry at a stage other than the start of the Course.
The Board considered that the correct procedures were in place. All candidates wishing for direct entry other than at Level 1 are interviewed with portfolio before acceptance onto the programme. Work presented at the interview is evaluated in accordance with the University's APL procedures.

- 13.8 **External examining arrangements**
The Board felt that the School had adequate mechanisms for responding to External Examiners comments. The Board met with four External Examiners.

The External Examiners expressed enthusiasm for the changes that the School has undergone over the last four/five years. They commended the committed staff body and noted that the level of ambition had been raised, and had developed naturally from Staff Members natural interests. The External Examiners felt that they had been consulted at every turn during this process of transition, and this was the most important topic of conversation between themselves and staff. The External Examiners praised the school for its open minded approach and engagement with continuous debate over feedback and changes within the School.

The External Examiners believed that the Unit System had increased the ambitions of the students and level 5 students in general were eager to get to grips with new challenges.

The External Examiners felt that the MArch is growing in momentum. The five intellectual choices that are introduced in the 4th Year gave the students to opportunity to adopt a critical design approach and the External Examiners felt that students look forward to the 5th year to expand their design horizons, with a significant increase in their confidence.

The Part Two examiners expressed a concern that the work seen at level 5 was not consistent. At the top level, the work was very interesting but at the bottom level the less able students suffered. The Examiners applauded the 5th year for liberating students but felt that this did not suit the less able students, largely because this approach had not been adopted earlier in their academic careers. This lack of preparation for some 5th year students resulted in mixed outcomes at the end of 5th year. The External Examiners expressed a belief that the less able students needed a better defined framework to keep them to a tighter academic path.

- 13.9 **Arrangements for Monitoring Professional Experience**

- 13.10 **Students;**
The Board was pleased to meet a large number of students from all years of each programme; the Board found the students to be very loyal to Architecture and committed to their subject.

Among the strengths of the Department the students highlighted the following:

- The approachability and helpfulness of the staff
- The Studio culture. The 1st Year Students found they benefited from the mixed studio environment because they had access to students from the years above them. Students felt that the new studio system connected both students and staff, and gave them more opportunity for contact with their tutors.
- The opportunities for interdisciplinary work.
- The extensive library facilities.

In support of Architecture, the students commented on the following areas which could be improved:

- Although the staff were generally accessible, some students felt that their tutors could be more available to students.
- There was inconsistent practice over feedback. Some Part Two students felt that they would have benefited from more written feedback, especially on their thesis, as well as a break down of their marks. Some students mentioned they found this an isolating experience. Students would like more group work to assist with receiving feedback from tutors.
- Whilst students appreciated the security implications of a 24 hour studio, they would like better access to studios because the space is often over subscribed. Some students felt that the studio needed to be more structured as the 'hot desking' did not suit everybody.
- Students would like a better integration of technology across their projects. The Students noted the Technology staff across the five years were under great pressure, and this resulted in a lack of one-to-one teaching or tutorials.

Tutors do not have time to see all students, and the students felt there was an emphasis on self learning. The Part Two students noted that because the 4th Year was concentrated on meeting the ARB Technology criteria it was difficult to get access to resources for Year 5; they also felt that the Technology tutors were too concentrated on Year 4 to the possible detriment of Year 5 students. Students also felt that there was a 'tick-box' attitude to Technology, and this left them feeling disappointed and unable to experiment.

- Students would like to see an improvement to the CAD facilities. Although the wireless internet in the studios was seen as a benefit the students would like to be provided with better software packages on which to learn.
- Students were concerned about the balance between staff teaching and researching. Some of the students felt that the more recently appointed tutors, were too research-based, and somewhat unapproachable.

13.11 Staff;

The staff meeting was attended by academic, technical and support staff, both part time and full time. The Dean of School did not attend. The Board noted the staff's commitment to the students and staff acknowledgement of the support received from and the positive attitude of the students.

The Board felt that the Staff were a positive and coherent team, who worked well together to meet the needs of the students. Many members of staff highlighted the supportiveness and commitment of both students and staff as a strength of the School.

The Board considered however that the Staff were under great pressure at all levels. The academic staff were concerned that if any one member of staff was absent for more than a week there

would be serious consequences across the School. The Board also felt that research commitments of staff encroach on teaching and tutoring time. This was also a real cause for concern for students. In general, the Board was concerned at the level of staff resourcing and felt that the Institution and School should address this issue as a priority.

The staff considered that the way the Studio is used has improved since moving into the College. Although there can be bottlenecks regarding studio space, the space has recently been refurnished. Staff highlighted the 9pm building closure as putting a lot of stress on students. Staff felt that the opening hours were not those of a research institute.

The staff believed that the Technology within the Course was undergoing a period of change. Four years ago the Technology lecture Courses were built up, and these are now impacting on the 1st and 2nd year. Didactic lecture programmes provide a foundation for the studio programmes.

The Staff are eager to dispel the impression that the school is technologically orientated and want to expand the breadth of Architecture at the School. It was clear that the Staff are trying to broaden the horizons of the programme and admitted that as with any School, they are faced with the dilemma of balancing competent and exploratory design.

The staff explained that the MArch was still to find its identity, there was a strong strategy in place to find the right balance between competency and exploration. The Staff are aware of the problems of technological emphasis in Year 4 and Cultural Context in Year 5, but as the course evolves, the humanities input will be increased.

13.12 Research;

The Board acknowledged the difficulty in getting funding for Architectural research and, considering this, the School were performing well. The Board noted the Anthropology links with Aberdeen regarding Architectural Analysis and Human Behaviour and the attempts to create links with Syria and Libya. The Board was pleased to note there were 8 PhD students who were keen to be involved in the teaching. Both students and staff highlighted the tension between research and teaching.

13.13 Equal Opportunities:

The School's Equal Opportunities policy satisfied the Board that the correct procedures were in place.

13.14 Resourcing and facilities;

Studios

The Studio Space was very good; it is large and spacious and although the students were not using the space at the time, as term had finished, it was evident to the Board that the studios provided a good environment for a lively studio culture. The School has recently introduced a more integrated way of working in the studios, with years 1-4 based in the same studio space. The change in space now opens up a previously used studio space into a review and exhibition space. The Board was also pleased to note the wireless provision in the studios.

Workshops

The Board noted that there was space for 21 students to work simultaneously. 7 were dedicated solely to Architecture students. The facilities provided in the workshop focused on woodwork and it was not possible to work on metal there. The Board noted the acquisition

of a new laser cutter. Overall, the workshops seem to function well and benefited from a thorough maintenance programme.

Library

The Board was impressed with the Library provision. Architecture had a dedicated section within the Duncan of Jordanstone library. The librarian estimated that there were 70-80,000 books on the shelves in the Architecture section, the stock is well used and anything not used for 4 years is stored in an archive in the basement. The library staff admitted to increasingly limited space and a desire for more computers, to add to the existing 3. The Architecture School recommend books to the library and they are able to order in as and when titles seemed popular. The Journal provision is also heavily used. There is a rich archive of books to which the students have access through the Library website. The Library staff described this as an extraordinary resource with a huge amount of material and information. The Board considered however the Library and students would benefit from more online journal access.

Physical Modelling lab

The School has a newly refurbished physical modelling lab that includes an artificial sky and a heliodon. The School has a monitoring lab for monitoring environmental factors and a micro station [?} for monitoring of micro climates. A wind tunnel is under construction.

Information Technology (IT)

The dedicated CAD studio houses 35 PCS, printing provision include large format plotter and colour laser hardware. The software provided on the computers was

standard. There is scope for more experimental packages to be used. Some students highlighted this issue, and noted that the free programmes which were available to download were not the most useful and up to date versions. There are not always enough computers to satisfy demand, especially during busy periods. The Board noted a renewal programme was imminent and welcomed the proposed enhancements, including larger screens. The Board believes it would be beneficial to students if the School were able to provide docking stations and replace CRT screens with flat panel monitors.

14. Attachments

14.1 Prior to the Visit, members of the Visiting Board received:

- School's Critical Self Appraisal
- Completed Questionnaire
- Staffing Details
- RIBA Visiting Board handbook including Mapping document, External Examiner Reports. External Examiner CVs
- Course descriptors

14.2 Copies of the following were made available in the Baseroom

14.3 During the visit, the Board received copies of the following:

- Supplementary cohort statistics
- MArch Regulations
- Part 1 & Part 2 Module Specification Forms
- School Handbook
- Exam Board Minutes

- Staff / Student Liaison Meetings
- Student SWOT Analysis
- Timetables, Years 1-5, Semesters 1 and 2
- Engagement with the Profession
- IT Facilities
- Staff CVs
- Research Activities
- Financial Resources
- Professional Experience Arrangements
- Staff Development
- Dissertation Topics
- Exam Questions
- Reading Lists
- Part 2: MP&L ASSA Contract Game
- University of Dundee Restructuring
- Equal Opportunities Policy
- Quality Assurance Procedures
- University Marking Scheme
- Accreditation of Prior Learning
- Accreditation of Prior Experiential Learning