

RIBA Education Review Frequently Asked Questions

September 2015

The following questions have been compiled as a result of the six regional workshops conducted with UK Schools of Architecture following the RIBA Education Forum.

Please consult the April 2015 update document to find a list of the recommendations approved by the RIBA Council resulting from the RIBA Education Review.

Drivers

- One of the drivers of the review is to address the conversion rate from the number of students starting Part 1 to those registering as architects. What about students who do not wish to become architects?

The RIBA recognises that not all students embarking on architecture courses intend to become registered architects, and do not wish to see these students hindered in any way. As a result, we fully intend that, at their discretion, schools maintain an exit award after the first cycle of study.

The nature of the recommendations may allow for the professional skills content to be substituted with a specific topic in order for students not looking for a professional qualification to instead embark on a specialised Masters programme. The RIBA are in discussions with the Department for Business, Innovation & Skills (BIS) to see whether or not funding could be provided for students undertaking a course such as this.

However, for students wishing to become an architect, implementation of the RIBA recommendations should provide a route, which enables access to registration within seven years.

- Might more graduates registering as architects and competing for the same jobs be disadvantageous to students?

While an increased number of architects could potentially be one result of the implementation of the recommendations, the RIBA do not believe that this is a valid reason to maintain the status quo.

In the current system, a student can technically register as an architect in seven years. Unfortunately, it is rare that this happens. These recommendations aim to deliver on that promise.

Increasing the number of young people entering the profession as registered architects can only be beneficial to the diversity and quality of work produced.

- How does this model make studying architecture more affordable?

While the recommendations do not necessarily reduce the number of years which a student will be required to pay tuition fees, the RIBA hopes that by providing a

**Royal Institute of
British Architects**

66 Portland Place,
London, W1B 1AD, UK
Tel: +44 (0)20 7580 5533
Fax: +44 (0)20 7255 1541

info@riba.org
www.architecture.com

route to enable access to the register sooner, that graduates will be able to move onto higher salaries quicker.

Furthermore, by encouraging the integration and embedding of professional skills, the RIBA envisages that more Schools of Architecture will consider sandwich courses, which would reduce tuition fees.

Course Structure

- Will there still be an exit award after the first cycle of study?

Yes. The RIBA does not wish schools of architecture to lose the ability to award a qualification at the end of the first cycle of study. It is important that this achievement is recognised, and that a mechanism for transferring between schools of architecture is maintained.

There is no intention for the proposed model to reduce flexibility or tie students to a single school of architecture.

- I am concerned that the teaching of different curricula areas at different points in courses will result in less movement of students between schools. Could you explain how these recommendations retain the flexibility to transfer between schools that we have in the current system?

Even within the current system, different Part 1 courses across the country do not teach exactly the same content. However, schools of architecture may be able to accept students who transfer in the middle of a Part 1 course using the credit transfer system.

As per the current system, it will be up to individual Schools of Architecture to decide on their individual admissions criteria.

Whether or not the first cycle of study is validated by the RIBA is still a matter of discussion, but should the RIBA retain this option, it could potentially act as a 'passport' for changing schools of architecture. It is likely that standard criteria that can be applied across the board will remain as it is assumed the ARB will choose to still prescribe the entirety of a course of architecture.

- Will conversion courses be offered to those with first degrees in subjects other than architecture?

The RIBA appreciates that offering conversion courses would allow increased diversity within the profession, and is keen to look further into whether or not this is something that would be viable.

The RIBA, however, is aware from conversations with BIS that offering a postgraduate conversion course would likely affect eligibility for maintenance loans at Part 1 and 2 for students who hold another degree and are therefore assessed as ELQ (Equal or Lower Qualification). Currently, students with a previous degree

who wish to study architecture are subject to an exception allowing them entitlement to maintenance loans. There is currently no funding available for postgraduate conversion courses.

- **If the test of professional competencies sits outside of the academic framework, how is this different from the current Part 3?**

The current Part 3 consists of both the teaching of professional competencies as well as a mechanism for testing this knowledge. The recommendations subsume the teaching of professional competencies into the five years of academic study.

Should a school of architecture complete the teaching of professional competencies by the end of the first year of the professional cycle (and a student has completed their 24 months of professional experience), a student would be able to take the test of professional competencies prior to completing the professional cycle of studies. It is this flexibility that will enable an increased number of students to access the register upon final graduation and enter full-time employment, with a greater understanding of the professional and commercial context of architecture.

- **What will the test of professional competencies be?**

This has not yet been decided, and is still up for discussion.

- **Will students have to pay an additional fee to undertake the test of professional competencies?**

It is likely that there will be a fee attached to the test of professional competencies.

- **Could elements of the Part 3 curriculum be reduced?**

The current Part 3 provision across the UK is extremely disparate, and the curriculum has been subject to extreme growth. The RIBA believes that it is important to review this in conjunction with a rigorous discussion surrounding which professional skills should have been acquired by a student at the point of their registering as an architect.

- **What curricular areas will be lost in order to subsume the professional skills content within the professional cycle?**

It is not the intention of the recommendations for professional skills content to replace any specific element of the curriculum, but that all course content will be integrated and rationalised to enable a more holistic approach to the teaching of architecture. When (for example) skills in energy and resource efficient design were subsumed into course content, they simply became another design parameter.

- **What constitutes design? Could the 50% required by RIBA validation be interpreted more flexibly?**

It is an established requirement that at least half of assessed work should be design studio projects. However, design project work does not necessarily refer only to spatial and formal explorations; studio design projects should incorporate the breadth of theoretical, cultural, constructional; and resource efficient considerations. The 50% requirement should not be an issue; it is when these separate elements are separated out that delivery of all components can become problematic.

- **Could you explain what you mean by the term ‘integrated award’?**

We are referring to the term ‘integrated award’ to typically mean a combination of academic study and professional practical experience (PPE) that upon graduation leads to a final award of a level 7 Master’s degree, as defined by the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA). PPE in this context is not credit-bearing, although professional experience may be credit-bearing if undertaken as work-based learning. The term ‘integrated award’ does not refer to a single seven year academic award.

- **Can an institution offer multiple pathways?**

Yes. The RIBA is keen to retain as much flexibility within courses of architecture as possible, and would encourage Higher Education Institutions (HEI) to make a diverse education offer.

- **Could the professional skills content of a course be replaced with a more specialised subject area in order to appeal to students who might not wish to access the register?**

Yes. The nature of the recommendations may allow for the professional skills content to be substituted with a specific topic in order for students not looking for a professional qualification to embark on specialised masters. The RIBA are in discussions with the Department for Business, Innovation & Skills (BIS) to see whether or not funding could be provided for students undertaking a course such as this.

- **Can the professional skills content be retrofitted at a later date?**

Yes. Should a student decide to embark on a specialised Masters course after the first cycle of study, but later wish to register as an architect, there will be the functionality to enable this to happen.

Similarly, graduates from courses abroad may wish to retrofit these professional skills in the UK and so a method will be available to enable this to occur.

- **Could there be an opportunity to establish different criteria for the two cycles of study? (i.e. not just the 11 points for both?)**

The RIBA will be comprehensively reviewing the validation criteria and procedures as part of this process.

It is, however, important to remember that the Architect's Registration Board (ARB) prescribes courses which students must undertake in order to access the register. The ARB's *Routes to Registrations* review (which may be informed by the Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Triennial Review of the ARB) may impact on some of these questions.

- Will the QAA subject benchmarking be reviewed?

Yes. In due course we expect that the QAA subject benchmarking statement will be updated to reflect the recommendations.

- What academic qualification would a student be awarded? Would it remain a Level 7 award (the majority of which are currently MArch)?

Yes, on completion of both the first and professional cycles of study a student would be expected to have gained a Level 7 award. BIS will not provide student funding for anything higher than a first degree (including integrated masters). BIS treat the five years of undergraduate study (for funding purposes) as a continuous undergraduate course.

Professional Experience

- I am concerned that this model is dependent on students securing relevant and quality experience. How are the RIBA and the profession going to support this?

The RIBA appreciates that professional experience offered by practices and undertaken by students is very varied across the country, and that this will inevitably reflect variations in the economic cycle.

One of the strands of work resulting from the RIBA Education Forum is liaison and consultation with architecture practices regarding possible assessment criteria and processes for PPE as well as establishing best practice for relationships between practices and universities. We plan to start this work in autumn 2015.

The RIBA are also planning to consider how Chartered Practice criteria may be utilised to support these recommendations.

- Have you taken into account that building valuable and sustainable relationships with practices in certain regions will be problematic due to the vagaries of the economic cycle?

The RIBA is, of course, aware that the impact of the economic cycle is felt more in some areas than others. Schools of architecture will know their local demographic in terms of audiences and industry much better than the RIBA. As a result not all schools of architecture will feel that it is appropriate to construct course structures that include work-based learning or sandwich years. All models proposed by different schools of architecture will necessarily reflect their individual idiosyncrasies.

The RIBA is not proposing one set model or course structure. How these recommendations are interpreted in different ways will be key to the diversity of provision and the challenge is for schools of architecture to reimagine courses in a way that works for them.

- **How will PPE be monitored? Is this the responsibility of the universities?**

We envisage that individuals equivalent to the current Professional Studies Advisors (PSA) will still play a role in monitoring the 24 months professional experience that a student undertakes, but are also keen to explore the role in which the practices themselves will play.

We are also consulting with other professional bodies such as the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons (RCVS) to see how experience is monitored and structured in other sectors.

- **Have you consulted Professional Indemnity Insurers to consider any implications to indemnity insurance offered to graduates who have access to the register of architects within an integrated award?**

Not yet, although this is something we will do.

- **Could we usefully redefine what we mean by practice? For example, could the PEDR be opened up to include live projects? Could practical experience accumulate credits AND be recorded on the PEDR?**

We would like practice to encompass as broad a definition as possible, although the more detailed elements of this discussion will take place as part of the follow-up work with practices.

- **Will small practices be consulted alongside larger ones?**

Yes. We believe that it is vital to obtain input from a diverse range of practices in order to fully understand how best to implement the recommendations from a sector perspective.

RIBA Validation

- **Will the first cycle of study still be professionally validated and prescribed?**

We cannot answer on behalf of the ARB, but as the EU Directive stipulates a minimum of four years academic study, it seems unlikely that prescription would be removed from the first cycle of study.

Whether or not the first cycle of study is validated by the RIBA will be up for discussion during the quinquennial review of RIBA validation criteria and procedures.

- If the first cycle is not validated, who will establish a threshold of competence (with agreed learning outcomes) at the conclusion of the first award to provide some guarantees of a student's capability to enter the professional cycle? Does this compromise the EU principle of access to education?

If changes are made so that there is effectively no means for students to move location when transferring from the first to second cycle of study, it would be up to the individual schools of architecture to establish their own admissions criteria to the professional cycle (ensuring that the criteria meets the necessary requirements as stipulated by the the statutory body and EU legislation).

- If it is not professionally validated, would this allow for students from associated disciplines to pursue architecture as a discipline in the professional cycle?

This might be a possibility, but as previously stated, there will be certain restrictions that must be adhered to in order to meet the relevant legislation. For example, the EU Directive states that the training to become an architect must comprise (as a minimum): "not less than four years of full-time study at a university or a comparable teaching institution leading to successful completion of a university-level examination".

Many of these discussions will be influenced by the forthcoming ARB's *Routes to Registration* review.

- What impact will the quinquennial RIBA validation criteria review have on this process and at what point would new courses be re-validated?

The quinquennial RIBA validation review will be the culmination of the work from the RIBA Education Review, and closely reflect the recommendations that have been approved by the RIBA Council.

We hope to be able to give UK Schools of Architecture an idea of the direction of travel on the new criteria by Easter 2016. If possible, we would like to be able to tie in any course changes within the current schedule of validation already in place at a school of architecture so that the recommendations do not create unnecessary work. Depending on the ambition of a course change, new courses may need to be re-validated, however, the RIBA wishes to manage the transition to the new standards with a minimum of unnecessary bureaucracy, whilst still maintaining academic standards. Proposed changes will be assessed on an individual basis, and we would encourage schools of architecture to involve the RIBA informally, and from an early stage, so that the process can be facilitated effectively.

- Could RIBA validation review the environment in which architecture is taught?

It was suggested at a number of the regional workshops that perhaps the RIBA could state ideal space standards - and other aspects of the resources required for a successful education in architecture - as part of the validation process. The importance of aligning RIBA validation with the QAA benchmarking statement was also stressed. These comments will be fed into the review process.

- How does this impact on courses that are ARB-prescribed but not RIBA-validated?

Non RIBA validated schools of architecture were invited to the regional workshops alongside RIBA validated schools of architecture to ensure that the conversations included the widest range of perspectives. We believe that the recommendations will benefit the profession and so ideally would like agreement from all course providers whether RIBA validated or not. However, only RIBA validated schools of architecture will need to adhere to the revised RIBA validation criteria and procedures.

Co-dependencies: ARB and European Professional Qualifications Directorate (PQD)

- How has the ARB been involved in the RIBA Education Review? What implications on the review are there in terms of the DCLG's triennial review of the ARB and the ARB's *Routes to Registration* review?

It is important to recognise that the ARB is the UK's statutory body for architects. The RIBA is a membership body for the profession. DCLG are currently conducting the triennial review of the ARB, and one of the areas specifically being considered is the overlap between ARB prescription and RIBA validation. Once this is complete, the ARB plans to resume their own *Routes to Registration* review. We have been working closely with the ARB to ensure they have been informed at every stage of the RIBA Education Review.

These activities are of course co-dependent and any decisions arising will be monitored closely to assess potential impact on the RIBA recommendations. We recognise this could be a long process, and may ultimately influence course provision. We felt that it was vitally important to continue with the RIBA Education Review, so that our conclusions could be fed into these other areas of work.

- Is it possible that the UK could end up with a tiered profession as per some other countries?

This will be dependent on the work outlined above. The RIBA does not determine or regulate access to the register.

- If both frameworks (4+2, 5+0) outlined under the EU Professional Qualifications Directorate are permissible in the UK, could a course of architecture potentially condense the number academic years into four? When will we know which framework is being adopted?

The EU Directive states:

“Training as an architect shall comprise:

(a) a total of at least five years of full-time study at a university or a comparable teaching institution, leading to successful completion of a university-level examination; or

(b) not less than four years of full-time study at a university or a comparable teaching institution leading to successful completion of a university-level examination, accompanied by a certificate attesting to the completion of two years of professional traineeship in accordance with paragraph 4.”

We are currently waiting for confirmation from the DCLG as to whether both frameworks will be permissible, or whether the UK will be required to choose which model to adopt.

Should the DCLG and ARB decide that students can access the register using the 4+2 framework, it is possible that DBIS would decide to only fund four years of academic study as opposed to the five that is currently a requirement in the UK.

- Why can't learning be defined in credits rather than years in the PQD?

We appreciate that the Bologna Process uses credits to define learning, and indeed utilising this method of measuring learning was suggested to DCLG. Unfortunately, the proposal was not adopted as there were concerns about the acceptability of this approach among a majority of EU member states.

- How will EU and international students access the register if all the professional skills content are subsumed within the professional cycle?

By law, a mechanism must remain to ensure that EU and international students can access the register in the UK. The exact nature of this cannot be agreed until the DCLG and ARB finalise their work.

Implementation

- When do you envisage these recommendations being implemented by?

The timeline for implementation will be different for each school of architecture, and will depend on their own internal institutional regulations as well as their RIBA validation cycle. We hope that the majority of schools of architecture will have begun the formal implementation by September 2018.

The timeline in the appendix at the end of the document suggests how this might transpire and outlines some of the overarching activities that will need to occur to meet this deadline. It is, however, not a rigid timeline and we are keen to work closely with schools of architecture to make the process as easy as possible. We are also aware that organisations such as QAA and UCAS will need to be involved in the process, which will take time.

- What would be the transitional arrangements between the incoming and outgoing systems?

There will necessarily be an overlap between the incoming and outgoing structures, as we do not wish to penalise students who are currently enrolled in a

course of architecture. The detailed arrangements of how this will operate will be discussed in due course.

- **How will students on current course structures be accommodated?**

Current and new students should not be concerned about the impact on their route to registration. Any revisions implemented will ensure that a practical route to qualification will remain available for existing students as well as those who have completed historical qualifications.

Other

- **How will the current breadth of UK architecture education be maintained?**

The key to the RIBA Education Review is the ability to interpret the recommendations flexibly and creatively. The intention is not to produce one model route to registration. Diversity is key to the profession and to the schools of architecture, and we believe that these recommendations will facilitate an increase in the breadth and depth of provision across the UK.

- **How will these recommendations impact on funding available for students and institutions?**

Currently full-time eligible students domiciled and studying in England are able to apply for a tuition fee and maintenance loan for what is viewed for funding purposes as a five year course (current Parts 1 and 2), and are able to take up to three academic years out between Part 1 and Part 2, while still retaining access to the same funding package and entitlement to pay undergraduate tuition fees at the level set at the start of their studies (plus inflation).

It is very important to the RIBA to ensure that any changes made to the structure of architecture courses as a result of the various ongoing reviews do not jeopardise either the provision of student funding currently available, or the ability of universities to deliver qualifications. Due to the high levels of debt already experienced by students, it is equally important to ensure students will be able to access funding throughout the entirety of their academic course, regardless of what changes are made to the structure. As a result, the RIBA have been liaising with contacts at the DBIS and the relevant devolved administrations to safeguard a new course structure against any unforeseen funding consequences.

From initial conversations, DBIS have suggested that the recommendations should not impact on the current provision available. They stressed that they would not be able to increase their spending on student finance, and so any course structure which proposed funding more than the current five years funded for architecture would be a matter of concern. The RIBA is remaining in close contact to ensure that they are kept up-to-date as the review progresses.

We are also in discussions with the relevant funding authorities in Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales to ensure that national variations are taken into account.

One of the next areas of work will be to meet with the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) to ensure a similar safeguarding for institutional funding.

- Are there implications for student visas?

We are hopeful that if a student chose to undertake the test of professional qualifications before the end of the professional cycle, some of the issues currently surrounding visas may be eased.

- How are these recommendations going to produce anything radically different from what is currently available?

We believe that integrating the teaching of professional competencies into the academic framework will produce a radically different pedagogy, and change the way in which architecture as a subject is thought about and taught.

- What are the implications for Schools who do not currently offer a Part 1, Part 2 and Part 3 course?

We do not expect that all schools of architecture will offer all elements of the course. It is hoped that schools of architecture who do not currently offer Part 3 will seek advice on how best to implement the teaching of professional skills into the rest of the course and may have the facility to use an external specialist for this.

- Do we have to implement the recommendations or can we merely maintain our current courses?

All courses currently running meet the legislation outlined in the EU Directive. The RIBA cannot enforce change on the profession as it is not the regulatory body.

However, the RIBA recommendations will be integrated into the revised RIBA validation criteria and procedures, and these will stipulate preferences for programme delivery and comment on content. Achieving RIBA validation remains, of course, an option for course providers.

- Have you considered the variations in devolved national administrations? (i.e. Scotland have a 4 years honours Part 1 course)

When we began the RIBA Education Review by concentrating on courses in England, we were aware of the nuances regarding funding across the UK. We look forward to working closely with the relevant schools of architecture in order to produce a model that complies with the recommendations while taking into account national and regional specificities.

Terminology

ARB Routes to Registration Review – The ARB committed to reviewing their current routes to registration in conjunction with reviews undertaken by the UK Architectural Education Review Group; the Future of the Built Environment Education and Practice Review Group; and the Royal Institute of British Architects Education Review Group. Originally this was planned to take place in 2014-16 taking into account that the UK will be required to transpose and implement the changes set out in the revised Qualifications Directive by late 2015 or early 2016.¹ The DCLG Triennial Review of the ARB has delayed this and the Routes to Registration Review is now on hold.

Department of Communities and Local Government (DCLG) Triennial Review of the Architects Registration Board (ARB) – The ARB is not a Non Departmental Public Body, which is why ARB is not subject to a Periodic Review. However, it is good practice to review all similar organisations and the DCLG has therefore committed to conduct a Periodic Review, which review the functions and form of the ARB and its establishing legislation the Architects Act 1997 (as amended) in accordance with Cabinet Office guidelines on the review of arms length bodies.² The review began in April 2014.

European Mutual Recognition of Professional Qualifications Directorate (PQD) - The Directive establishes rules according to which a Member State which makes access to or pursuit of a regulated profession in its territory contingent upon possession of specific professional qualifications (referred to hereinafter as the host Member State) shall recognise professional qualifications obtained in one or more other Member States (referred to hereinafter as the home Member State) and which allow the holder of the said qualifications to pursue the same profession there, for access to and pursuit of that profession.³

First cycle – This refers to the period of study which in current course structures are called the Part 1.

Integrated course - In the context of the RIBA Education Review, the term ‘integrated award’ will typically mean a combination of academic study and professional practical experience (PPE) that upon graduation leads to a final award of a level 7 Master’s degree,

¹ ARB (2014), *Update on Review of Routes to Registration*

<<http://www.arb.org.uk/files/files/Board%20Sept%202014/13UpdateonReviewofRoutestoRegistration.pdf>>

² ARB, *Outline Work Plan: Periodic Review*

<http://www.arb.org.uk/Scripts/wysiwyg/ckeditor/ckfinder/userfiles/Images/images/files/BM_18_Sept_13/Item-09-Open-Business-Plan-Annex-D.pdf>

DCLG (2014), *Architects Regulation and the Architects Registration Board Call for Evidence: Context document*

<https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/304271/ARB_doc.pdf>

ARB, *Periodic Review*

<<http://www.arb.org.uk/periodic-review>>

³ Official Journal of the European Union (2005), *Directive 2005/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the*

Council <<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?qid=1401715075231&uri=CELEX%3A32005L0036>>

Official Journal of the European Union (2013), *Directive 2013/55/EU of the European Parliament and of the*

Council <http://www.eaeev.org/fileadmin/downloads/sop/DIR_2013_55_EU_amended_rpq.pdf>

as defined by the Quality Assurance Agency. The term 'integrated award' does not refer to a single seven year academic award.

Professional cycle – This refers to the period of study which in current course structures are called the Part 2.

Professional Practical Experience (PPE) – Professional work experience currently referred to as Stage 1 and Stage 2 experience and can be recorded on PEDR sheets. In the current system, this experience cannot be credit-bearing. The undertaking of PPE may involve a student being registered with a university for the purpose of logging and monitoring the experience, (e.g. using the RIBA's PEDR system), but sits outside the academic framework.

Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) Subject Benchmarking Statement - Subject Benchmark Statements set out expectations about standards of degrees in a range of subject areas. They describe what gives a discipline its coherence and identity, and define what can be expected of a graduate in terms of the abilities and skills needed to develop understanding or competence in the subject.

Working closely with the higher education sector, the QAA have published Subject Benchmark Statements for a range of disciplines. Some Statements combine or make reference to professional standards required by external professional or regulatory bodies in the discipline.⁴

Quinquennial Review of RIBA Validation Criteria & Procedures - RIBA Validation is a peer review process that monitors compliance with internationally recognised minimum standards in architectural education and encourages excellence and diversity in student achievement. The criteria and procedures associated with this process are reviewed every five years.

Sandwich course - A course is a sandwich course if it is not a course for the initial training of teachers, it consists of alternate periods of full-time study in an institution and periods of work experience; and taking the course as a whole, the student attends the periods of full-time study for an average of not less than 18 weeks in each year.⁵

Specialised masters – This term refers to the second cycle of study where a student undertakes postgraduate study, but chooses to specialise in something other than the professional aspects of architecture. The professional competencies which the recommendations are advocating are integrated into the professional cycle in the new structure can be replaced with a specialised subject. This would not lead to registration as an architect, although the professional competencies could be retrofitted at a later date should the student wish.

⁴ QAA, *The UK Quality Code for Higher Education* <<http://www.qaa.ac.uk/assuring-standards-and-quality/the-quality-code/subject-benchmark-statements>>

⁵ Student Finance England (2015), *2015/16 HE Student Finance Assessing Eligibility Guidance*, p66 <http://www.practitioners.slc.co.uk/media/2482/sfe_assessing_eligibility_guidance_15-16_final_1_2.pdf>

Test of Professional Competencies – This will test the professional competencies, which in current course structures would be assessed in the Part 3.

Work-based learning - Learning in the workplace is a structured academic programme, controlled by HE institutions, and delivered in the workplace by academic staff of the institution, or staff of the employer, or both.⁶ It typically refers to the delivery of credit-bearing, academic units or modules by the university while a student is located in the work place (but remains registered with their university). These academic units can be related or unrelated to activity in the workplace, as defined by the institution, with the credits gained in work-based learning forming part of the academic programme of study.

⁶ Student Finance England (2015), 2015/16 HE Student Finance Assessing Eligibility Guidance, p66
<http://www.practitioners.slc.co.uk/media/2482/sfe_assessing_eligibility_guidance_15-16_final_1_2.pdf>

Appendix: Suggested timeline of activity

2015	2016	2017	2018
diffusion: 6+ regional w'shops w/50 schools			
defining/assessing prof'l skills: 5+ mtgs			
collaborative compact: 5+ mtgs with practices S M L XL			
	rewriting validation criteria/graduate attributes: 6+ w'shops w/SCHOSA, APSAA, ARB, RIBA	give notice to schools	
	rewriting validation procedures: 6+ w'shops w/SCHOSA, APSAA, RIBA	give notice to schools	
	disestablish and reselect validation panel: RIBA Education department/VP Education		
	schools internally revalidate programmes: submit new programmes to RIBA New Courses Group		
		validation training: first phase workshops	
		validation training: second phase workshops	
			implement new courses and validation procedures