

Royal Institute of British Architects

**Report of the RIBA Visiting Board
to the University of Edinburgh
Confirmed by RIBA Education Committee
29 November 2006**

**School of Arts, Culture and Environment
The College of Humanities and Social
Science**

**MA (Hons) Architectural Design, Part One
Master of Architecture (Design), Part Two**

Date of Visiting Board: 24-26 May 2006

1. Information About the Courses

1.1 Courses offered for revalidation:

MA (Hons) Architectural Design, Part One
Master of Architecture (Design), Part Two

1.2 Address of the Institution where the courses are delivered

Architecture

School of Arts, Culture and Environment
The University of Edinburgh
20 Chambers Street
Edinburgh
EH1 1JZ

T: + 44 (0) 131 650 2306

F: + 44 (0) 131 650 8019

W: www.ed.ac.uk

1.3 Name of Awarding Body

University of Edinburgh

1.4 Name of Head of School of Arts, Culture and Environment

Professor Angus Macdonald

Name of Head of School of Architecture

Ms Fiona McLachlan

2. Membership of the Visiting Board

2.1 The members of the RIBA Visiting Board for the visit on 24-26 May 2006 were:

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Alan Jones | (Chair) |
| David Porter | (Vice-Chair) |
| Virginia Newman | |
| Musa Garba | |
| Mike Packham | (Non Architect Member) |
| John Ashton | (Student/Graduate member) |
| Arnie Dunn | (Royal Incorporation of Architects in Scotland representative) |

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

3. Procedures & Criteria for the Visit

3.1 The Visiting Board 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 further 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:

MA (Hons) Architectural Design, Part One
Master of Architecture (Design), Part Two

4.2 The next Visiting Board should take place in 2010.

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

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

5.2 The Visiting Board was satisfied that the Part One 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 Background

The Department of Architecture at Edinburgh University is a well-established and respected school of architecture. It attracts high-calibre students to its programmes and is committed to an access policy that promotes those who will benefit most from being admitted. It responds positively and decisively to external advice and recommendations but has the confidence to defend its position when necessary. It has undergone change with regard to premises and university organisation since the last Visiting Board which it has managed admirably well without compromising academic standards. Staff and students work well together in a creative atmosphere of investigation and experimentation. While hoping that the School is allowed time to consolidate its present position, the Board is confident it is well placed to develop and respond to future challenges.

For its Part One programme, the School operates a distinctive four-year thin sandwich course incorporating a two-semester placement in practice. The placement occupies the second semester of the third year and the first semester of the fourth year; it is an integral, credited element of the programme.

10.2 The School's strengths and distinctive features include:

- The excellent staff/student relationships.
- The exceptional peer group support.
- The non-hierarchical, democratic and collaborative nature of the staff body.
- Its position in School of Arts, Culture and Environment allowing for exciting and fruitful collaboration with History of Art and Music.
- The School's arrangements for monitoring professional practice in the Part One course are an exemplar of good practice. The Board encourages the School to publicise its activities in this area as it would help to improve the experience of other students.
- The new widening participation admissions policy is beginning to have a positive effect.
- The physical resources, including an exemplary workshop and 24-hour access to the studios. The 24hour culture is attractive to students and part of the spirit of the School.
- Its international outlook.
- Its location in Edinburgh, being a capital city and centre of the arts. This is very attractive to students.
- The distinctive sandwich structure of the Part One, combining academic periods with a two semester placement.
- Its model for group work. Students undertake different parts of a project, so they gain all the benefits of group work while developing their individual skills and interests.
- The Project for the alignment of architectural education in East Central Scotland is very exciting.

10.3 Recommendations

- 10.3.1 The Board made no recommendations.

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 advises that the role and usefulness of the Academic Portfolio course at both Part One and Part Two be clarified. The Board acknowledges that this has been introduced only recently, but its purpose, delivery, management and use need to be considered carefully and to be clearly expressed to staff and students and External Examiners. It is potentially a very powerful tool, but in its present form it raised queries. The benefits are that it encourages students to reflect critically on their work. It is a useful exercise for students to curate and edit it, but the School should separate it from the criteria and as an exercise to demonstrate compliance with the criteria.
- 10.4.3 The Board advises the School to clarify the role of the External Examiners in relation to their stated procedures.
- 10.4.4 The Board advises the School to provide more organised feedback to students at the formative stages of the programme.
- 10.4.5 The Board advises the School to monitor the balance between drawn and written work.
- 10.4.6 The Board advises that a strategy is put in place on an agreed minimum level of complexity to final Honours (Fourth) year projects.

11. **Summary of Previous Visiting Board Reports**

- 11.1 The last RIBA ARB Visiting Board to the University of Edinburgh took place on 08-09 March 2001. The Board recommended that Continued Recognition be granted to:
 - Part One: MA (Hons) in Architectural Design (four years full-time)
 - Part Three: Professional Practice and Management Examination

The Visiting Board recommended that Continued Conditional Recognition be granted to:

 - Part Two: Bachelor of Architecture (two-years, full-time)
- 11.2 Summary of March 2001 Visiting Board Report

“The Department’s strengths included a highly committed and supportive staff and a lively, bright and enthusiastic student body. The Department benefits from a number of excellent facilities and a very good studio culture. In addition, the Board noted that there was a strong level of debate taking place within the Department. Since the last visit, there has been a succession of two new Heads of Department.

“The Board noted that the Part One course met the appropriate Criteria for Validation. The Board found that Year One and Year Two were particularly strong and established a sound basis from which students could progress to Year Three (and Year Four). The Board was

pleased to note the variety and range of design options available to students in Year Three and Year Four. The Board recommends however, that the Department may wish to consider introducing a number of sessions in basic drawing skills for students in the early years of the course to provide all students with a general background in this area. This would be particularly beneficial to weaker students or those without a design background.

“The Board had some concerns regarding the Part Two course. The Board found that some students had difficulty in demonstrating a competence in the integrated design of complex types of building. The Board noted that this may be a consequence of the amount of group work undertaken by students and that the Department should consider reviewing this aspect of the course. As a result the Board recommended that the Department must submit the external examiner reports for the next two years, to reassure the Board that this issue has been addressed.

“The Board found that the Part Three course/examination met the appropriate Part Three criteria. This School prepares candidates well for the ASSA examination.”

12. Details of the Conditions in Item 8.

- 12.1 There were no conditions attached to the courses listed in 4.1

13. Commentary

13.1 Self-Appraisal and Developments since the last visit

The Critical Self-Appraisal was comprehensive but it could have been used to state their current position. It also did not include, for example, the softer aspects of an architecture course documenting the student experience. The Board found during the visit that there were many positive aspects of the School’s provision that had not been included in the Critical Self-Appraisal, which was open, honest and accurate, but did not include the whole picture. An appendix summary document was attached to the Critical Self-appraisal which had been written by the students.

From its conversations with staff and students the Board found a convivial, non-hierarchical environment. Architecture at Edinburgh has undergone several major changes since the last Visiting Board; some planned (such as the University administrative restructuring exercise, the academic year and the validated programmes), others prompted by unforeseen events (the 2002 fire).

In 2002 the University replaced its Faculty and Departmental structure with three ‘Colleges’ incorporating 21 ‘Schools’. Subject areas were grouped according to common themes; thus Architecture joined Music, History of Art and Archaeology in the School of Arts, Culture and Environment. In 2004 History of Art staff and students and some music staff joined architecture in the Chambers Street building. This first of all administrative and then physical proximity has already stimulated interesting and innovative collaborations between subject areas and presents exciting possibilities for future research.

The administrative restructuring also affords the Colleges and their component Schools a great level of autonomy regarding budgets and human resources. The management of this appears to work very well, with closer working relationships between the various components of the Colleges and with the central University administration. There is also a direct conduit of communication through all levels, from students to the Principal.

Starting with the 2004/2005 academic session, the University has implemented a semester system, replacing the three terms. All programme structures, content and credit weightings were reviewed and adjusted accordingly. The most significant change to the Part One award was the repositioning of the professional placement.

In 2002 the School suffered a fire which ultimately resulted in greatly improved physical facilities. The refurbishment allowed them to refurbish and extend the Art and Architecture library to include a new floor. It also allowed them to make extensive improvements to the workshop.

The School operates with the role of Head of Architecture being rotated every three to four years between senior members of staff. This is appropriate in a School which has a very flat hierarchy within its management structure. The School has a strong sense of direction which is held collectively.

SHEFC funding has been received to explore the viability of realigning architectural education in East Scotland. This was officially launched in May 2006 and at first will chiefly involve postgraduate opportunities. There is a stated

intent to explore the possibility of an Edinburgh School of Architecture jointly run by the University of Edinburgh and Edinburgh College of Art, drawing on the expertise and opportunities offered by the two institutions.

The Department is also considering making an appointment to the Forbes Chair in Architecture, which has been vacant for 15 years. The staff are presently discussing the purpose of the Chair and the role of any future incumbent.

Part Three in Scotland is now administered by the Architects' Professional Examinations Authority in Scotland (APEAS) Ltd. This is validated separately. The present Board therefore did not inspect Part 3 work.

The Board considered that the School had managed radical change admirably well, with minimum disruption and without compromising the quality of education. However, the Board believes that a period of stability is now needed to allow Architecture to consolidate its present position.

13.2 Documentation and Arrangements for the Visit

The documentation was sent well in advance of the visit. It was comprehensive and extremely detailed, almost to the point of being confusing despite being exhaustively cross-referenced. However, it included a very useful index which identified essential documents for which the Board was very grateful.

All arrangements for the visit were excellent. The programme of meetings and facilities visits worked very well. The Visiting Board had two meetings with External Examiners to accommodate the Examiners' availability

and also the RIBA Validation Committee's stipulation that the Board must hold discussion with a proportion of the External Examiners of both Parts One and Two after having viewed student work. The Board met all External Examiners at the first meeting and two on the second day, which gave them the opportunity to discuss points which had arisen on examination of the work.

The visit coincided with the end of year exhibition and the External Examiners' visit, therefore work of all students was available for the Board to view. The required sample of student work for the Board's purposes was clearly identified.

Editorial decisions made by students when curating their work for the Academic Portfolio course led to some essential pieces of work being excluded. However, the staff were able and willing to locate this material at very short notice, for which the Board offers its thanks. This illustrates the problem of the confusion surrounding the role and function of the Academic Portfolio, hence the Board's Advice in 10.4.2.

13.2.1 *Record of Academic Portfolios sampled during the visit*

Due to the structure of the course the RIBA and School agreed on the following sample of portfolios:

MA (Hons) Architectural Design (Part One)

i. Year 1

Arch Design 1

- 1 lowest pass
- 1 middle pass
- 1 high pass

From a cohort of 71

ii. Year 2

Arch Design 2

- 1 lowest pass
- 1 middle pass
- 1 high pass

From a cohort of 42

iii. Year 1 & 2 Lecture courses

- 1 lowest pass
- 1 middle pass
- 1 high pass

iii. Year 3

Design Option 1 .

- The lowest pass from each individual unit
- 2 middle passes (selected across units)
- 2 high passes (selected across units)

Third year lecture and distance learning work (Placement: Working Learning) :

- 1 lowest pass
- 2 middle passes
- 2 high passes

from a cohort of 55

iv. Year 4:

Design Option 2

- The lowest from each individual unit
- 1 middle pass in each unit (School's choice)
- 1 high pass in each unit (School's choice)

Academic Portfolio 1

3 lowest passes
2 middle passes
2 high passes

In addition, the School identified the Academic Portfolios of the 3 lowest OVERALL passes in the validated route of the degree.

Written work : Dissertations and Placement Reports

1 lowest pass
2 middle passes
2 high passes

From a graduating cohort of 46.

M.Arch (Design)

v. Year 1

MArch “Thesis 1”

3 lowest passes
2 middle passes
2 high passes

From a cohort of 31

vi. Year 2

MArch “Closure”

3 lowest passes
2 middle passes
2 high passes

Academic Portfolio 2

3 lowest passes
2 middle passes
2 high passes

From a graduating cohort of 29.

The Board asked the staff to provide them with work undertaken by the students but which the students had omitted from their portfolios. This was due, not to insufficient coverage of the criteria, but to the editing of students’ work for inclusion in the ‘Academic Portfolio’ as defined by the School.

13.3 Responses made to the previous Visiting Board report and external examiner comments.

The Board considered that the School progressed significantly since the last Visit. It has proved itself very responsive to the recommendations of the last report.

The Part Two course was conditioned in 2001 because the Visiting Board considered that some students had difficulty in demonstrating a competence in the integrated design of complex types of building. The 2001 Board noted that this might be a consequence of the amount of group work undertaken by the students. The Condition stipulated “that the Department of Architecture must submit the External Examiners’ Reports for the Part Two course for the next two years (following the 2000/2001 and 2001/2001 academic sessions) so that the Board may reassure itself that the concerns have been addressed and commented upon by the External Examiners.” This was subsequently amended to include a report on how the Department proposed to address the External Examiners’ comments and the time-frame in which these comments would be addressed. This was duly done and the

condition discharged. When viewing the work during the visit, the 2006 Board had no concerns about this aspect of the programme.

The 2001 Visiting Board recommended that the Department might wish to consider introducing sessions in basic drawing skills in the early years to provide all students with a general background in this area. The 2006 Visiting Board observed that students' communication skills are very strong at both Part One and Part Two.

There has appeared previously to be a history of overmarking at Part Two (raised by the 1995 and 2001 Boards). The 2006 Board considered that present assessment regimes were rigorous and fair and that the work viewed had received an appropriate mark. The previous Board had expressed concerns over Group work. The present Board considered that this had now become a strength of the School.

13.4 Context of the courses within the wider provision of the school and Faculty.

Architecture is co-located with Archaeology, History of Art and Music in the School of Arts, Culture and the Environment, within the College of Humanities and Social Science.

In addition to the validated Part One and Part Two courses, the Department of Architecture offers a growing range of taught MSc/PGDip courses, in Advanced Architectural Design, Architectural Project Management, Design and Digital Media, Sound Design (in collaboration with Music) and Sound Environments. There are also Research Postgraduate Programmes in Digital Media and Culture, Architectural Design Practice, MPhils and PhDs.

There is also an MA (Hons) Architectural Studies into which students may transfer if they do not meet the requirements to progress into Level Three of the Part One programme or do not wish to.

The potential for interdisciplinary learning is tremendous and is already being explored, one example of which is the active participation of a sound designer from the music department in the architecture course.

The Board felt that the Project for the alignment of architectural education in East central Scotland was potentially a very exciting development and could greatly increase opportunities for interdisciplinary teaching, learning and research. This explores collaborations between Edinburgh College of Art, Edinburgh University and Heriot-Watt University.

13.5 Detailed Commentary on the Course leading to Part One qualification

13.5.1 Clarity, validity and achievement of course objectives
The educational aims of the MA (Hons) Architectural Design are clearly set out in the programme specification. The School states that the theme that underpins their approach to architectural education is that everything students do will be a process of enquiry. This ethos is apparent throughout the school and reinforced by its commitment to research.

The Board considered that the course objectives were clear, valid and largely being achieved.

13.5.2 Course design and content

The Board believed that the MA (Hons) Architectural Design (Part One) was designed, managed and organised effectively.

It is a four-year sandwich course incorporating a two-semester placement in practice.

From the 2004/2005 academic session the placement takes place in the second semester of the third year and the first semester of the fourth year, having previously been staggered in shorter phases between the third and fourth year of Part One and the first year of Part Two. This placement is an integral, credited element of the programme.

The programme is divided into ‘courses’. The ‘Academic Portfolio 1’ course at the end of the fourth year is the chief vehicle for demonstrating compliance with the criteria and must be passed in order to graduate with an Honours degree. Students indicate in their portfolio where they believe they have met the programme’s learning outcomes, in which the criteria are embedded. This is a recent innovation and although the purpose of the exercise was clear to the staff, the students are less sure. The Board also agrees that potentially it is a powerful tool but as it presently stands it is confusing and is seen by students as unnecessary duplication of work already done.

Edinburgh students on four-year programmes must incorporate a so-called ‘outside’ subject into their studies in the second year. Besides broadening the experience of architecture students, another benefit is its capacity to introduce students of other disciplines to architecture. Over 200 full-time Edinburgh students follow some

architecture courses in addition to their own degree programme. The University believes that this breadth of offer is what makes Edinburgh distinctive and such academic diversity is applauded by the Board.

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 portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part One Validation Criteria in the area of Design were being met by all graduates from the MA (Hons) Architectural Design programme.

The programme addresses all areas of design criteria and this is apparent in the work. Elements are fully integrated and not done in isolation. Students’ design work benefits from the innovative placing of the placement during Part One, as it addresses many regulatory, construction and health and safety matters. The programme structure also ensures that students have experience of working as part of a team, not only in the academic but also the professional environment. The level of attainment in design at the School is also driven by the much improved workshop facilities.

The Board draws the School’s attention to the balance between drawn and written work. There is a great emphasis on writing, which is commendable, but the Board observed that in some presentations the written component was disproportionate to the graphic design element. The Board advises the School to monitor the balance between drawn and written work.

The three strands of the studio in the fourth year are commendable in giving students choice. However, while all criteria were being met, the Board observed a lack of variety of scale and complexity in the final year projects and advises the School to consider carefully the scale of fourth year projects in future. In particular the scale should not be permitted to reduce further. The Board noted the rigorous theoretical, design and constructional approach to the smallest projects, but advises that a strategy is put in place on an agreed minimum level of complexity to final year projects.

- *Technology & Environment*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part One Validation Criteria in the area of Technology and Environment were being met by all graduates from the MA (Hons) Architectural Design programme.

This area of the criteria is addressed at a high level. There is an excellent level of technical competence. Students' knowledge is fully integrated into their design projects and additionally examined in written papers which also demonstrate a high level of attainment.

Students benefit from comprehensive input through taught courses. The earlier teaching is reinforced through the professional placement, which gives them insights into professional regulations such as the codes of practice, health and safety legislation and so forth. This is reflected in the work delivered at fourth year level.

- *Cultural Context*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part One Validation

Criteria in the area of Cultural Context were being met by all graduates from the MA (Hons) Architectural Design programme.

The Board considered that the criteria were more than adequately met and that the School reaches far beyond the minimum requirement. This is a stated intention of theirs and in viewing the work the Board confirms that this ambition is clearly achieved. The School makes full use of its situation in the School of Arts, Culture and Environment to form and exploit connections with history of art and music. History pervades the whole programme. This enriches and builds upon this area of the criteria. The criteria are clearly integrated in the taught elements of the course and translate fluently from lecture and written work into design work.

The Board was pleased to see design projects based in cities outside the region, such as Madrid and Paris, sites which reflect the philosophy of the School.

- *Communication*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part One Validation Criteria in the area of Communication were being met by all graduates from the MA (Hons) Architectural Design programme.

The programme begins with an introduction to a wide range of communications media, such as model making, video, audio and hand-drawing. A sound base is developed through the academic years; in so doing the School has thoroughly addressed the concerns raised by the 2001 Visiting Board. Their professional practice clearly demonstrates this appreciation of effective

communication in various forms. There is good adoption of current technologies.

The woodwork and metalwork workshops are clearly much used of by students. They are highly valued and essential to the development of design. The workshop provision is exemplary and has a significant impact on the achievement of the criteria for design and communication.

- *Management Practice & Law*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part One Validation Criteria in the area of Management, Practice and Law were being met by all graduates from the MA (Hons) Architectural Design programme.

There is clear preparation provided by the school prior to students' professional experience and through the additional work carried out by the students while on placement. The students' understanding of and compliance with the criteria clearly benefit.

The 'Academic Portfolio' course assists the students in reflecting critically on their work and is the means for students to undertake imaginative and creative explorations of issues around Management, Practice and Law. The Board considered this to be a fine example of best practice.

- *Preparation for Professional Experience, (Part 1 only)*

The Placement period has recently been moved to sit wholly within Part One. This counts as a formal part of the course for which students receive credits. Prior to going on placement students take an introductory short course in preparation.

While on placement students, in addition to their work in practice, must undertake three pieces of coursework which must be submitted online. The School has developed a WebCT tool to enable students to communicate with each other and with tutors while on placement. Staff are always available to answer queries via email. The final piece of work is a reflective report on their experience.

The Board commended the repositioning of the placement. The Board considered that the students benefit greatly from having up to twelve months in practice before their final project. This leads to a level of maturity in their work and an additional level of professionalism. Moreover, it encourages mobility between schools of architecture as it neither ties students to Edinburgh nor discourages Part One graduates from other institutions from applying to Edinburgh for Part Two. The repositioning of the placement did create some teething problems of which the School is completely aware, for example, the heaviness of the workload. The Board considered that the School appears to be dealing with these problems effectively.

13.5.4 Progression within the course

The programme provides clear and sustained academic development and progression, effectively demonstrated in the portfolios.

13.5.5 Assessment: methods, content and coverage, relative weightings, standards achieved

The School has recently revised its assessment regime and bandings to make them a more sensitive measurement tool with more descriptor levels, allowing greater use of the spread of marks. Work is assessed through a combination of portfolio presentation, essays, tutorial

presentations, written examination and coursework appropriate to the area of study. All grade descriptors are explicitly stated in the programme handbooks.

Students must pass first and second year in order to progress. The Academic Portfolio was introduced partly to deal with the question of compensation and also to try to make the compilation of an academic portfolio a positive experience, by awarding students credits for their work. In the third and fourth year it is possible to fail a course which can then be compensated by up to 40 credits. However, there are checks and balances to ensure that all criteria are met. Although a student might fail Architectural Design Option 1 (third year), they must pass Academic Portfolio 1 to demonstrate design competence. If they failed the design course in Year 3, compliance would depend on how well the student performed in Architectural Design Option 2 (fourth year) which is intended to be a strenuous and comprehensive module. The students also receive feedback sheets indicating compliance with criteria, which are first assessed relatively early in order to identify any weaknesses which can be addressed before the final assessment.

The School has not identified any major problems with plagiarism, but the University does take a robust stance on it and offers advice to students on how to ensure that it does not happen, even unwittingly.

The Board was content that the assessment regime was fair and rigorous.

The Board considered that the feedback students receive is adequate but advises that more formal feedback is given,

particularly during the formative stages of the course, as the students said that they would find this helpful.

Student progression and completion rates are excellent.

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

Admissions are handled centrally by the College of Humanities and Social Sciences. In addition to the University and College general entry requirements, students must achieve BBBB in SQA Highers and there are also requirements for maths and physics at Standard Grade. At GCE A Level students must achieve BBB; again there are GCSE requirements for maths and double science or physics at grade B. Whichever examinations system has been followed, students must also demonstrate artistic ability. There are no interviews at this stage.

The above describes the minimum academic requirement; however, the University has recently implemented a widening participation strategy in an attempt to make the University more accessible to those who might not otherwise consider applying. As yet it is too early for the University or for architecture to analyse precisely the results, but in effects are beginning to be felt. Staff also participate in Schools Outreach and summer access courses. The Board compliments the University and the Architecture Department on their commitment to this initiative and looks forward to seeing how it develops.

It is possible for students to transfer into architecture from another discipline at Edinburgh, but in almost all cases this involves starting again at Year 1. This is to enable them to take Architectural Design 1, which is an

essential element of the programme. Applications for transfer must be made to the College and are subject to the same consideration as UCAS submissions. Students who do not have the necessary qualifications are not permitted to transfer. Direct entry into the second year is possible; the candidate must present a transcript of marks and portfolio for review. Entry beyond second year is not permitted. The subject area leader may exercise his or her discretion over such matters and although there are guidelines, each application is treated on a case by case basis.

13.6 Detailed Commentary on the Course leading to Part Two qualification

13.6.1 Clarity, validity and achievement of course objectives
The course objectives were clearly outlined in the Programme Specification document and in the Programme Handbooks. These were expressed in a series of learning outcomes in which the criteria are embedded. The Board agreed that these were clearly being achieved.

13.6.2 Course Design and content
The Master of Architecture (Design) is a two-year full time programme divided into compulsory ‘courses’. It culminates with the Thesis Project, in which compliance with the criteria must be demonstrated. In addition to this, students must also take the ‘Academic Portfolio 2’ course. Overall the Board believed that the course design and content was appropriate but its concerns about the Academic Portfolio course at Part One apply equally to Part Two.

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 was satisfied that all the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Design were being met by all graduates from the M.Arch (Design) programme.

The Board compliments the students’ ambition and completeness of presentation, demonstrated in design work that was well-resolved, vigorous, explorative, energetic and structured.

The students’ talents and skills are drawn out and developed by enthusiastic and effective design leadership. Both in Part One and Part Two, design is led by staff who are informed by their research specialities and interests. This is evidently appreciated and welcomed by the students.

There was imaginative consideration and integration of Technology and Environment, Cultural Context with Management, Practice and Law within the Academic Portfolio and there is strong emphasis on the experience and using by potential occupants and passers-by to the design proposals. There was also a good mixture of strong theoretical and cultural basis to the work and systematic testing of designs. The students write extensive design reports that demonstrated the integration of design, theory and practical matters of health and safety. There was a strong mix of team and individual work, with a suitable division of work which entails students working on specific areas within a project, allowing them all the benefits of teamworking whilst developing their own skills

and minimising the possibility of stronger students carrying weaker ones.

The Board commends the opportunities for students to undertake projects outside the UK, such as the ongoing projects in Malta and Shanghai, and those in Budapest and Istanbul.

- *Technology & Environment*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Technology and Environment were being met by all graduates from the M.Arch (Design) programme.

A strong part of the studio culture is the understanding of making and of the technological aspects of creating architecture, both at an urban building and detailed level. The students' designs clearly work at the level of human comfort and enjoyment with a clear integration of design aspirations with technology and environment.

The aspects of structural and constructional strategy were clearly evident from initial concept through to detailed resolution. Excellent contributions to the programme are provided by experts in related fields such as structural, mechanical and electrical engineers. Students can also consult acousticians. The results of this interdisciplinary approach also contribute to the fulfilment of the communications criteria.

- *Cultural Context*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part Two Validation

Criteria in the area of Cultural Context were being met by all graduates from the M.Arch (Design) programme.

This is a very strong aspect of the programme, which is reinforced by connections with history of art and architectural cultural readings. It benefits greatly from staff research interests. Taking the students out of the UK environment helps them to gain an appreciation of concept which can be applied anywhere. It also brings to their attention aspects of the environment that they do not meet in the UK (for example, the treeless state of Malta) and climatic issues.

The academic portfolio addresses the issues of being able to "Critically appraise and form considered judgements about the spatial, aesthetic, technical and social qualities of a design within the scope and scale of a wider environment". The structuring of interim submissions assists in their critical appraisal of judgements and design proposals.

- *Communication*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Communication were being met by all graduates from the M.Arch (Design) programme.

The students are very strong in this area and the standard is very good. Students use a wide range of media, but use them quite critically. The Board commends the high quality of the students' curating and editorial skills; work is clear, controlled and intelligently edited, being prepared appropriately for public consumption. As at Part One, the workshop facilities play a major role in the realisation of

students' design ambitions and the exploration of various media.

There is a strong tradition and high quality of written work. The final Thesis Reports were excellent.

- *Management Practice & Law*

On the basis of the sample of portfolios provided, the Board was satisfied that all the Part Two Validation Criteria in the area of Management, Practice and Law were being met by all graduates from the M.Arch (Design) programme.

This is addressed specifically in a dedicated course in the second year of the M.Arch, which is also intended as preparation in part for Part Three, although naturally students are expected to consider such issues as an integral part of the Architectural Design courses via the design reports. The implications of cost are demonstrated in the design reports.

The Architectural Management, Practice and Law course is assessed in two ways: a written report which must relate to the individual's design project work, and accounts for 30% of the overall mark in this area; and also by written examination which is worth 70% of the overall. The Board considered that the combination of written report and examination provided comprehensive coverage of these criteria.

13.6.4 Progression

The course content and academic progression run seamlessly over the two years.

13.6.5 Assessment

The assessment regime at Part Two the same as at Part One, with the exception that the award is not classified, but graded as Pass, Fail and Distinction. There are strict conditions of progression from Year 1 to Year 2 of the M.Arch.

Achievement is assessed through portfolio review, written reports, coursework and, in the case of Management, Practice and Law, written examination.

The Board was content that earlier concerns about overmarking at Part Two had been addressed and there was no evidence of it among the work viewed during the present visit. Student progression and completion rates are excellent.

13.6.6 Admissions

Candidates for Part Two are required to have a good first degree, to have Part One exemption and a strong portfolio. From 2006/7 there will be no automatic progression to the Edinburgh Part Two. This policy widens access to the Edinburgh M.Arch programme from graduates of other institutions. As the Edinburgh Part Two is a discrete two-year award, entry from other institutions is simple.

The School also offers a parallel non-validated M.Arch (Studies) award. It is intended for overseas students who have either completed a first degree in Architecture and who do not have a validated Part One award. It is possible to transfer to the validated Design route if they successfully undertake the ARB Prescription Examination for Part One prior to the final M.Arch examinations.

13.7 External examining arrangements

The Board held two meetings with various External Examiners to accommodate their availability and also to comply with the RIBA's requirement that the Board have the opportunity to discuss issues with the Externals after having viewed student work. There are presently five external examiners attached to the Part One and Part Two programmes.

The External Examiners expressed great support for the School and were very impressed with the level of attainment.

Their role is to confirm that the University's assessment procedures are adhered to. They do not interview individual students. In their view this had a positive effect in allowing the work to speak for itself, enabling them to gauge the level and character of a unit. They also believed that interviewing individuals would be inappropriate in the case of group work. Through conversation there appeared to be a need for the School to ensure external examiners were clear with regard to their remit and assessing compliance with the criteria.

The Externals considered that the marking at Edinburgh was very stringent and there was certainly no evidence of overmarking.

External examiners' reports are sent to the University. Specific issues are then identified to which the Department must respond. External examiners are also asked for their comments at each Exam Board meeting. Ultimately they receive a written response and have the opportunity the following year to discuss with staff issues

identified in the portfolios. The School is happy to disagree with the External Examiners' opinions and to argue their case, which the Externals and the Board thought was very healthy.

The Externals hold a general meeting with students to answer their questions about assessment and to gauge their opinions on the programme and facilities at the School which are then fed back to the staff.

The Examiners made the following comments:

- Edinburgh presents difficult, challenging programmes. Students demonstrate intuitive, creative thought that develops into good design. Standards overall are very high.
- The External Examiners held varying views on the academic portfolio. Some found it very good and very complete. The best ones have been 'curated' to a high standard, being reflective, contextualising each piece of work and demonstrating process. There was a risk that students' editing decisions might inadvertently result in an incomplete submission and therefore potentially fail. It is suggested that a consensus should be reached on what constitutes a complete submission. However, the academic portfolio has improved since being introduced and did highlight a student's strengths and weaknesses. It could be a powerful vehicle if harnessed; however, the exercise itself and the timing of it is somewhat onerous for students, who feel it is a duplication of effort. It does provide a very visible way of seeing poor work improving and students should be afforded the time to make it a reflective process.
- Graduates are exceptionally motivated across all levels of achievement. The level of application is impressive.

- There were no concerns about group work or about authorship. There is sufficient individual work in each group project for the Externals to reassure themselves of individual attainment.
- Preparation for practice is very good, equipping students to deal with many different situations. The Externals were particularly impressed with the placement itself, in particular the virtual environment in which they can communicate. The resulting work from this part of the course was excellent.
- Previous concerns about the integration of technology have been thoroughly addressed to good effect. It is now embedded in the Honours programme and revisited in the M.Arch.
- The direction of the school is fluid and influenced by individuals on the staff and their research interests. The Examiners considered it had a particular identity in design output, which seems to be driven by a cluster of individuals and partly based on deep theoretical research.
- The second year of the Part Two has improved tremendously, particularly in the area of management, practice and law, which is now integrated with studio .
- There are some very strong and powerful results in the final project.
- The External Examiners believed that the concerns of the 2001 Board regarding technology and environment are being met. They had seen some elaborate technical studies, which were both visually attractive and technically competent.
- The students' standards of literacy were similarly excellent. Their essay writing blends seamlessly with other work. Students benefit from the School's history and theory expertise. The Externals believed this aspect would be strengthened in the coming years.

- Issues raised by students in their meeting with the External Examiners included seeking confirmation that the assessment procedures had been followed, the wish to retain 24-hour access to the studios.
- A smoother transition between technology and environment and design projects in MArch 2.

The Board expressed some reservations that the External Examiners do not meet the students individually, but noted that this although this is becoming increasingly common across the sector. The Board acknowledged, however, that the External Examiners had given a very positive and convincing view of this method.

The Board noted, that the External Examiners were content with the assessment of group work, but still considered that it was difficult to know what a student's individual contribution was and to award an appropriate mark.

The Board was interested that the students asked questions about how assessment was undertaken, when this was very clearly stated in the student handbooks.

13.8 Arrangements for Monitoring Professional Experience

The Board believed that the arrangements for monitoring professional practice were an exemplar of good practice. The School has established and encouraged a lively, interactive on-line community which promoted good communications between staff and students. All staff, including the head of school are on hand to answer questions.

The Board encourages the School to publicise its methods in this area.

13.9 Students

After a slow start attendance at the Board's meeting with students grew and the Board was content that it had a representative selection of students from both Part One and Part Two.

The students were highly articulate and even the first years eventually contributed effectively. The student body were cohesive, positive and interesting, greatly supportive of the school and appreciative of the staff, the programmes and the physical facilities which they value highly.

Students were attracted to Edinburgh because of

- The workshops. The students were extremely enthusiastic about the workshops and saw them as being central to their learning experience.
- The studio space, including 24-hour access and the lively and explorative studio culture. Students were concerned that the 24-hour access arrangements may be under threat. They are regarded as 'their' space. They do a lot of group work and installation work, which could not be done at home. Any reduction in accessibility would have an impact on what they were able to produce and the materials they can use. The nature of their work would be altered if they did not have access to these facilities.
- Regular tuition.
- The theoretical nature of the M.Arch.
- The quality life in Edinburgh, namely its status as a capital city, the accessibility of national resources and its compact nature.

- The enthusiasm of the teaching staff and the good staff/student working relationships.

The new system of placement was beginning to settle down. It was hard to balance their university work and their placement work although they had been given helpful lectures in the first semester. Workload had been an issue as often the School did not know how much work students were given by their firms. Staff and students have discussed this and it is beginning to be resolved. Some were concerned that the written work in the placement semesters was given an equal weighting with design work.

Students were becoming accustomed to the pattern of 1 semester in school, followed by two in practice, followed by a final semester in School. Although they had only one semester to complete, they felt it was possible given careful time management and it also gave them the opportunity to apply what they had learnt on placement to their academic work. The older students commented that the new system sounded like an improvement on that under which they had studied.

Pastoral care and academic guidance are good. Students receive considered, impartial advice on their options if they feel architecture is not for them.

Students appeared to be generally content with IT provision. Most now have their own PCs or laptops. Computers are plentiful but there is a lack of licences for particular programmes at certain times within the academic year. There was a suggestion that further printing facilities would be appreciated. They would appreciate another A3 printer.

Apart from the lack of availability there are no particular problems with software or a conflict between what is available at the School, what they have on their own machines or what is provided by the company on placement. Teaching has become more formal than when the present M.Arch students were in Part One, when they were allowed to use whatever programmes they wished. The present MA (Hons) students had not found Archicad particularly useful in the workplace.

An annual 'computer fee' is payable by the students. Some students believed that it was an extra hidden cost but others did not share this concern. They felt it was more in the nature of a wear and tear levy on the studios. Printing and model making was much more expensive.

Some subsidies are available for field trips, which are generally considered good value. There is a field trip in the second year of the Part 1 course and one extensive trip within the Part 2 course. The students said the architecture department has done an excellent job in raising money, but that the money it is able to contribute shrinks every year. The students try to raise additional funds by organising social events, which do not always achieve their goal of making money but are enjoyed nonetheless.

Students have good access to tutors and specialist teachers. There are regular scheduled slots in the earlier years, and in later years students can arrange sessions as and when they need it. Visits of specialists such as engineers are publicised and students can sign up for a discussion if they wish.

The MArch students appreciated the wide range of external guest critics, who are not just architects but philosophers, politicians and so forth. These are interesting and insightful. Resources for these sessions are shrinking, despite the resourcefulness of tutors. However the choice of external visitors is largely determined by the tutors. The Board believed that there could be more discussion between staff and students regarding events and guest lecturers.

The training in hand-drawing is welcomed by students. The present M.Arch student hand-drew throughout their course, even at the final thesis. Students now have a choice. There is no pressure to do it a certain way, but the university does encourage them to use hand-drawing, particularly when returning from placements.

It was clear from the meeting with the students that there is a lack of clarity and understanding of the role and benefits of the academic portfolio. The M.Arch students felt that they compromised their final thesis by having to do the Academic Portfolio 2 course at the same time. It felt repetitive and the timing was poor. The hand-in time was two to three weeks before the completion of other pieces of work which they would have liked to include. They believe there would have been more learning benefits if the timing were better. They did not understand the purpose of the exercise, which made it difficult to complete it well.

The Honours graduates voiced similar concerns. They had four days after the final design to complete the portfolio and said it felt rushed. They acknowledged that it was useful to go over what had been learned in the previous four years, as it demonstrated progression, but felt that it

was not directly useful to them. The present fourth years had also disposed of old work before the Academic Portfolio course was introduced.

The students appeared to understand the assessment criteria although not all of them made use of the programme handbooks (the so-called 'Blue' books).

Individual feedback could be better. Essays receive written feedback, but not studio work although students can discuss this with their tutors if they wish. However, they considered that what is said in crits is reliably indicative of their progress and what remedial work might need to be done. They are not given marks during the year but receive a grade at the end. Many of them considered that this freed them to do more exploratory work as the work is not grade-driven.

The M.Arch is research based and tutors are interested in the students' work as it helps inform their research. Students were aware of and understood the link between tutors' research interests and the programmes. In the Honours programme the courses are related to a subject in which the tutor is interested and again the students' work and tutors' research inform one another in a continuous cycle. The students thought that such design leadership might appear too directional for students transferring from another institution but for their part they understood it and were content.

There is an active student society which organises lectures and events. The membership fees pay for guest lecturers from London and overseas. They also organise cinema sessions and a Design Day. The Board considered that these activities were excellent and should be encouraged.

They were surprised that none of this was mentioned in the Critical Self-appraisal.

The School reported that there is a very slow growth in student numbers, approximately 5%. The School appears content with this and there are no plans to increase numbers. This is partly because the number of SHEFC funded places is capped. It would also place additional pressure on studio space, which would oblige the School to reconsider its teaching methods, perhaps to the detriment of the studio ethos of which it is proud.

There was some confusion as to the data of entrants to Part One but the number is approximately 70. Among the recent intake (2005/2006 academic session) numbers of male and female students were roughly equal. The School anticipates a Part One intake of 62 for the next academic session.

Part Two is increasingly popular, with an anticipated intake in 2006/7 of 35. The gender balance at Part Two is more heavily male, but this is not unusual in the sector.

The staff:student ratio is calculated at 1:19.

13.10 Staff

There are presently 17 full-time members of staff, supported by 4.69 FTE of part-time contract staff and a wide range of research assistants, specialist tutors, visiting lecturers and guest critics. An integral part of the team are the 3 administrative staff and five full-time technical staff. Many staff, both full-time and part time, are also active in practice which is reflected in their teaching and in their research activities.

The staff body appeared to be a cohesive community, working well together and enjoying a flat hierarchy. Decisions are reached by collective agreement. The Board considered that the involvement of support staff (technical and administrative) in the staff meeting was very encouraging, acknowledging their contribution to the activities of the school.

There is a great variety of background among the staff offering a rich diversity of specialisation both in the full-time and part-time staff. The staff are committed to the ideal of promoting inquiry and discussion and of allowing students the latitude to experiment. Artists, practitioners, furniture makers and sound engineers all contribute to the programmes. Research clearly feeds directly into teaching.

The staff support both the School and University Principal in seeing great benefits in the number of full time staff being actively engaged in practice. The staff see teaching, research and practice as inextricably linked in a continuous loop from which each activity benefits.

The School is hoping soon to make an appointment to the Forbes Chair of Architecture which has been vacant for fifteen years. The role of any future incumbent is being discussed carefully. At present staff believe it should be directed towards being an external champion of the School rather than design leadership, cultivating relationships with the university, industry and government.

The staff are aware of the students' concerns regarding the academic portfolio and the academic workload during the placement period and are working to address these.

13.11 Research

Edinburgh is a research-led university and all academic appointments are now made with the expectation that the postholder will be active in research. The University recognises that producing returnable research presents more of a challenge in some disciplines than others.

The architecture staff view the Research Assessment Exercise in 2008 as a huge challenge but are optimistic about improving on the rating achieved in 2001. In 2001 the Department achieved a 3b rating which led to a drop in funding. Since then Architecture has joined the new School of Arts, Culture and Environment (ACE) and it is hoped that the opportunities presented by this, with the formation of the ACE Graduate School and the revised approach to assessment anticipated at RAE 2008 will lead to a better result. Practitioners and staff who have previously been engaged chiefly in teaching are given support in becoming researchers. The University policy on sabbaticals has recently been clarified which will help.

The chief areas of research activity are Architectural Design and Theory, Architectural History, Digital Media, and Technology and Environment. Research is also benefiting from the improved physical facilities. Staff do not work in isolation but, increasingly, in groups, often covering more than one area and collaborating with staff in the other departments in the School.

In architecture the research clearly informs the teaching, which is appreciated by the students. Staff are teaching from the position of strength, infusing the courses with intellectual, leading edge, informed knowledge.

The School's involvement with practice-led research is seen as a strength and receives the strong backing of the Principal.

13.12 Equal Opportunities

The School adheres to the University's equal opportunities policies. At present the majority of the student population describes itself as white, but the School is observing gradual changes in the student profile as the widening participation initiative starts to take effect. The Board notes the number of high-achieving women in the School who act as role models for present and future students. There was good gender mix and mix of nationalities among the staff body.

The Board hopes that the School will take advantage of any further recruitment initiatives to address the gender balance.

13.13 Resourcing and facilities

The School is presently housed in three buildings. There is an ambition to be housed in one but the likelihood of this depends on funding arrangements and the outcome of the Project for the Alignment of Architectural Education.

In the meantime, the present physical resources are very good. The School benefits from control of its own budget which allows them to direct money where they believe it is most needed, whether it be additional staff or additional equipment.

- *Studios*

The studios are well used and much appreciated by the students. A creative and artistic atmosphere pervades them

and they have a positive impact on group work. The Board agreed with the staff and students that this is conducive to the philosophy of the school. The 24-hour access is a valued privilege and the Board agreed that it is highly beneficial in terms of output, morale, cohesiveness. This was one of the attractions in coming to Edinburgh. Studios and workshop were a strong draw and prized by students. The Board agrees that reduction in this could potentially have a negative impact on the scope and quality of the student output.

- *Workshops*

The on-site workshops provide a valuable resource. They are well used, well-organised and staffed with experienced staff, including two full-time technicians. Students are employed on a part-time basis as assistants. The staff are very aware of health and safety. There is a main carpentry workshop, a metal workshop, a research and structures workshop and a large student workshop. These facilities allow students to experiment with a wide range of materials.

These workshops and their staff are fundamental to the work and ethos of the school and the benefits they bring are clearly reflected in the students' work.

- *Library*

The School enjoys the advantage of the in-house Art and Architecture library, with 2 specialist librarians and 2 part-time librarians. The Library is one of the areas which ultimately benefited from the fire in 2002, as it was not only refurbished but also extended. This allowed the Library to house the History of Art collection which was a very positive development which brought enormous benefits for the architecture staff and students.

The Library is well-used by students and benefits from knowledgeable and enthusiastic staff. Unfortunately, due to budgetary constraints it can only open from 09.00 to 17.30; however the main University Library is open until 22.00.

The collection in the Art and Architecture library numbers 15000 books on architecture and related subjects, such as architectural design, architectural theory and practice, architectural history, construction, planning and urban design, landscape architecture and landscape history and History of Art. The School also benefits from it being the library for History of Art.

The Library also houses an impressive slide collection, containing approximately 100000 slides, which is gradually being digitised.

Books are available on loan for varying periods of time. Most of the stock in the Art and Architecture library may be borrowed for a week, but there is a reserve list of certain books which may only be borrowed overnight. The Librarian has ultimate discretion over loans and may sometimes allow reference books to be borrowed.

Budgets are allocated at College level, which then divides the monies between its component Schools. The Art and Architecture library is presently allocated £97K, part of which is allocated to journals. £18.5k is currently spent on print journals and £9.5k on e-journals. The rest is spent on books covering the four disciplines housed in the School of Arts, Culture and Environment. Architecture has £24k for monographs.

The acquisitions policy is not rigid There are representatives and a Library Committee. Requests for journal subscriptions must be put to the Committee but books may be ordered. Staff may order books themselves on-line or may pass their requests to the library staff

The Library subscribes to many databases, technical indexes and art abstracts. The University Library currently has a free trial of Artstor .

In addition to the Art and Architecture Library students also use the main University Library in George Square, which houses many hundreds more architecture-related titles, which are available on a one-month loan. Books may be obtained from other UK libraries on interlibrary loan.

During the 2005/2006 academic session, Edinburgh University and Edinburgh College of Art entered into a reciprocal arrangement allowing each other's students to borrow books from their respective collections. This has proved very successful so far. The Project for the alignment of architectural education with ECA will undoubtedly have an impact on specialist library provision but this cannot be assessed as yet.

In the Art and Architecture library there are six computers, a scanner and a photocopier. More PCs and workspaces are available in the main University Library.

The Board considered that there was adequate procurement of new books, journals and materials.

- *IT facilities*

On-site IT facilities are very good with all needs catered for. The breadth of the facilities is reflected in the high quality of student output. Students are also benefiting from the digital media course. Students must pay an annual £30 'computer fee'.

There is suitable provision for laptops, with wireless provision and WebCT. Students can access everything externally. Software can be a problem as there is a limited number of licences, restricting access at times of heavy use. The School is reviewing this along with IT provision as a whole and this may then improve. Apart from their concern about the insufficient number of licences, the students did not comment about the proposal to review the present systems.

There is a bookable video editing laboratory

- *DDA compliance*

The School's accommodation is within old buildings with the normal associated issues of circulation.

14. Documentation Provided

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

Prior to the Visit the School provided:

Critical Self-Appraisal
Questionnaire including:

- Course details
- strategic objectives

- sample course booklets
- course structure diagrams
- External examiners' reports, responses, guidelines.
- Admissions policies
- Student statistics
- Staffing
- Equal opportunities
- Awards
- Teaching and learning
- Assessment
- Professional experience arrangements
- School context, including management and academic structure diagrams
- Other taught courses
- Research activities
- Quality assurance documentation
- Physical resources
- Financial resources
- Engagement with profession

In the Base Room the School provided:

Student Handouts M.Arch 1 2003/2004
Student Handouts M.Arch 2 2003/2004

Student handouts – Architectural Design/Studies
2003/2004
Year 3 2003/2004
Year 4 2003/2004

Architectural Design/Studies Year 2 2003/2004
Practice of Architecture 2
Theory of Architecture 2

Students Handouts – Architectural Design/studio
2003/2004

Year 1
Practice of Architecture 1
Theory of Architecture 1 (Ah)
Theory of Architecture 1 (Bh)

Architectural Design/Studies Year 1 2004/2005
Architectural Design 1
Technology and Environment 1A
Technology and Environment 1B

Architectural Design/Studies Year 2 2004/2005
Architectural Design 2
Technology and Environment 2

Student handouts 2004/2005
Master of Architecture (Design)
M.Arch 1

Student handouts Master of Architecture (Design)
2004/2005
M.Arch 2

Programme and Course Handbooks for Architecture
2004/2005

M.A. (Hons) Architectural Design Past Papers
Master of Architecture Past Papers

Architectural Design/Studies 2005/2006
Year 1 Architectural Design 1
Technology and Environment 1A
Technology and Environment 1B

Architectural Design/Studies 2005/2006
Year 2
Architectural Design 2
Technology and Environment 2

Architectural Design/Studies 2005/2006
Year 3 Junior Honours
Year 4 Senior Honours

Student Handouts Master of Architecture (Design)
M.Arch 1 2005/2006

Student Handouts Master of Architecture (Design)
M.Arch 2 2005/2006

Handbooks
CPD
QA Checklists 2002/2003, 2003/2004, 2004/2005
Course Monitoring Forms
Staff/student Liaison Committee
External Examiners' reports
Grade Profiles

2005/2006

1. Health and Safety Handbook
2. M.A. (Hons) Architectural Design Handbook
2005/2006
3. Architectural Design 1
4. Technology and Environment 1A
5. Technology and Environment 1B
6. Architectural History 1C
7. Architectural Design 2
8. Technology and Environment 2
9. Technology and Environment 3

10. Architectural Design Theory
11. Architectural Design Placement – Working, Learning
12. Placement Report
13. Dissertation – Architectural Design
14. Academic Portfolio 1
15. Master of Architecture Programme Handbook

Practitioner involvement
Architecture forward plan 2004/2005
Research overview

WebCT access

Examples of staff publications (books, articles)
Events folder

Available electronically:

Assessment regulations
Quality Assurance procedures
QAA Institutional Review 2003
QAA Academic Review – subject review Architecture,
Architectural Technology and Landscape Architecture
2001
Staff CVs
Practitioner Externals
Staff development
Engagement with practice – bulletins, letters from
employers
School Plan 2005-2007

Architecture mission statement

University of Edinburgh documents:
Examinations handbook 2004
External examiners Code of Practice
Responsibilities of External Examiners
Joint Validation Panel Report 2001 and response
Teaching Programme Review report 2001 and response
External Examiners' CVs
Equality and Diversity policy