

Feedback from the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) (27 April 2017)

Further to our meeting of 31 March 2017, you suggested we write to formally confirm the RIBA's keen interest in reviewing the validation criteria as a matter of urgency. The following is a brief rationale supporting the pressing need for this review:

1. at the point of implementation of the current validation criteria and graduate attributes in September 2011, it was agreed that these criteria and attributes should be reviewed quinquennially (i.e. in, or by 2016)
2. the hiatus around publication of the Periodic Review Report has regrettably precluded discussion of this review, so time has been lost in modernising the basic frameworks for quality audit against which UK schools of architecture determine the professional relevance of their curricular content and delivery
3. there has been intense feedback from the schools of architecture that the current structure of the general and professional criteria is proscriptive and over-elaborated, and that a sensible reduction in the body/length of the criteria must be achieved
4. consequent on the above, and considered alone, the 11 points of the EU Architects Directive form the basis for the curricular content, structure, and delivery for architectural education throughout all EU member states
5. the strong move to work-based and distance learning models for UK architectural education is indicative of a demand from students for alternative routes to qualification, requiring further reform and refreshment of the criteria and attributes to accommodate more variation in the structure, content, and delivery of the courses/programmes in architecture offered in the UK
6. the criteria and attributes should be reframed in a manner allowing for broader interpretation of the role and remit of the architect, encouraging a range of programmes where inter-, trans-, and co-disciplinarity are all encouraged
7. subsuming the curricular content of the professional practice/RIBA part 3 examination (as recommended by the RIBA Education Review) offers schools the opportunity to develop wholly new models of education better suited to graduates electing into modern models of professional practice, with registration on graduation (as per the recent NCARB model)
8. the range of architecture programmes offered globally encompasses a very wide range of possibility, from a fine arts to an engineering-based emphasis; the UK

should embrace criteria and attributes that reflect the breadth of an architects' skills without proscribing these

9. the current criteria and attributes are congruent with the arguably outdated notion of a general practitioner architect based solely in the UK, and do not recognise the peripatetic nature of the modern global practitioner; review of the criteria will necessarily inform the ARB review of routes to registration, and contribute to the UK offering a paradigmatic model of education/registration
10. in embracing new, light touch criteria and attributes, the professional and statutory bodies will contribute to offering students access to an inclusive and diverse profession, meeting the consumer requirements of a modern multicultural UK society.'

Feedback from the Standing Conference of Heads of Schools of Architecture (SCHOSA) (24 April 2017)

'Members of the Architects' Registration Board, Routes to Registration Review

I am writing to you on behalf of SCHOSA to express concern from among our members over further delays to an ARB review of the Criteria for Validation.

Following the long awaited periodic review report we understand that the Routes to Registration Review is to be put on hold for the foreseeable future. We are particularly concerned that the Board has chosen to link its quinquennial reviews of the Criteria, the Prescription Processes and Procedures and the Prescribed Examination to the Routes to Registration review and has therefore failed to proceed with **any** of these reviews within the designated timeframe. Given that all these normal business reviews are now overdue and that there appears little prospect of being able to conduct them within the next two years, we respectfully request that the Board reconsiders its position.

We believe there is potentially much to be gained and nothing to be lost from proceeding at the earliest opportunity with the three reviews which have been seriously delayed.

The ARB's regulation of architectural education in the UK has effectively been in a moribund state during the past three years in the run up to and during the periodic review. To suspend the Criteria review process for any additional time given the current higher education landscape, appears to be an irrational and potentially highly damaging dereliction of the ARB's obligations as the UK's regulatory body. Triggering of Brexit makes the review even more urgent and rather than being an excuse for inertia, should provide an incentive to act.

We urge ARB to agree to proceed with all outstanding reviews at its meeting on 12th

May. SCHOSA would be happy to collaborate with ARB, RIBA and other relevant stakeholders in such a process.'

Feedback from the Association for Professional Studies in Architecture (APSA) (21 April 2017)

'On behalf of APSA I can confirm that APSA has firm views upon these matters and would wish to deliver feedback and comments. Because we are uncertain as to the nature of the intended review we can only provide an outline response at this time.

With regard to the potential review of the Criteria, we welcome this. This was discussed at our Spring Forum and the general consensus was that as they stand the Part 1 and Part 2 Criteria are rather cumbersome, poorly drafted with regard to management practice and law elements. It is also felt that the Criteria for Part 1 are too similar to those for Part 2, leading to the need for repetition in teaching, rather than progression. We also feel that because five of the eleven Criteria heads contain Professional Studies elements, it would be of paramount importance that APSA engage in any collaborative updating.

With regard to the review of the Procedures for Prescription of Qualifications, we feel that we may have some useful input to offer and we welcome any change proposed by the Board that may assist in reducing the administrative burden on schools.'