# THE PURPLE BOOK

## GUIDELINES FOR THE VALIDATION OF COURSES IN ARCHITECTURE BY SACAP VISITING BOARDS

## (Revision one : 01 September 2012)

architecture
OTHERWHERE
durban
2014

# Contents

# Foreword by the President of SACAP

These updated guidelines for the validation of courses in architecture reaffirm SACAP's commitment to quality architectural education in South Africa.

In terms of Clause 13 of the Architectural Profession Act 44 of 2000, SACAP has an obligation to :
(a) "conduct accreditation visits to any educational institution which has a department, school or faculty of architecture" and;
(b) to "either conditionally or unconditionally grant, refuse or withdraw accreditation to all educational institutions and their educational programmes with regard to architecture".

SACAP's validation visits are conducted by Visiting Boards. Each Visiting Board has a specific mandate to assess whether the standard of graduates – their knowledge and skills – comply with the minimum level of competencies demanded by SACAP for registration as a candidate in one of the four professional categories.

Visiting boards are expected to focus on product – the evidence of outputs presented to them – rather than process. In other words, Visiting Boards should accept the prerogative of Architectural Learning Sites to formulate their own teaching and learning strategies and refrain from telling them how to conduct their academic business.

If there are glaring flaws Visiting Boards may express an opinion and recommend areas where improvement is needed. Similarly, the validation status of an ALS is not contingent on aspects over which it has little control, such as accommodation, staff-learner ratios and facilities. The visiting board may, however, recommend better provision of resources to the management of the university where the ALS is situated.

Validation visits are intended as productive and positive events, and in spite of a necessary focus on minimum standards, Visiting Boards should recognise, applaud and congratulate the achievement of high standards and innovative approaches. Although the guidelines contained in the Purple Book may seem regimented – in order to ensure procedural consistency – it must also be emphasised that SACAP patently does not expect a homogeneous educational environment – rather, it encourages a diversity of philosophies, focuses and themes.

Finally, the validation schedule is presented on the following page. Since it is based on a cycle prescribed by the Act, SACAP expects the Architectural Learning Sites to respect the due dates.

Phill Mashabane
President: SACAP

# Validation schedule for the third term SACAP Council

| ARCHITECTURAL LEARNING SITE | COMPLETED | DUE |
|---|---|---|
| University of KwaZulu-Natal (UKZN) | Oct 2007 | ___ 2013 |
| University of Johannesburg (UJ) | May 2008 | ___ 2013 |
| Cape Peninsula University of Technology (CPUT) | Mar 2009 | ___ 2013 |
| Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University (NMMU) | May 2010 | ___ 2014 |
| Durban University of Technology (DUT) | Aug 2011 | ___ 2015 |
| University of Cape Town (UCT) | Mar 2011 | ___ 2015 |
| Tshwane University of Technology (TUT) | Jul 2012 | ___ 2016 |
| University of Pretoria (UP) | Mar 2012 | ___ 2016 |
| University of the Free State (UFS) | Oct 2012 | ___ 2016 |
| University of the Witwatersrand (WITS) | Aug 2012 | ___ 2016 |

# Editor's preface to the Purple Book

*Guidelines for the validation of courses in architecture by SACAP Visiting Boards,* also referred to as the Purple Book, supersedes the White Book (2007). In fact, it evolved from the latter and a number of paragraphs, sentences and ideas are reused verbatim. The White Book was compiled by David Yuill – the undisputed doyen of architectural validation in South Africa – who also contributed significantly to this updated version, as did other members of SACAP's Validation Committee.

The main changes largely involve administrative issues, including:

- Composition of Visiting Boards
- Funding arrangements
- Format of introductory document distributed prior to the visit
- Draft report to be completed before departure
- Executive summaries in Validation Reports to be published on SACAP website
- SACAP President to arbitrate appeals
- Visiting Boards are not to be entertained in the evenings.

The need for certain adjustments to the validation dispensation became evident after some awkward incidents in 2008 pertaining to the process. Debate inside SACAP's Validation Committee and consultation with the Heads of Schools produced the fundamental precepts. In addition, discussions in London with Mr Tony Godwin (CAA Executive Director), Prof. George Henderson (Senior Academic Advisor) and Prof. David Gloster (Director of Education, RIBA), and in Cape Town with Ms Clare Newton (Chair CAA Executive Committee Validation Panel), were extremely helpful.

This First Revision was initially based on a decision to insist that draft validation reports be completed before departure, as well as on a discussion between the Validation Committee and Dr Jaco Wasserfall (CAA Exco member) on 3 April 2012.

The Executive Committee of the CAA Validation Panel subsequently conducted a Comparative Analysis between Revision 1 dated 4 April 2012 (the SACAP procedures) and the CAA Procedures. At the end of the process Tony Godwin, the CAA Executive Director declared:

> The committee finds the procedures to be robust, clearly articulated and substantially equivalent to those of the CAA with some minor differences requiring attention to achieve equivalency to the CAA validation process.

Apart from modifications to this version of the Purple Book that will be indicated by date, SACAP intends a minor review after four years to link with the four year Council term, and a major review involving all stakeholders after eight years in 2020.


Gerald Steyn (Prof.)
Chair: SACAP Validation Committee

# 1   Introduction to validation

## 1.1   List of acronyms

- ALS            Architectural Learning Site
- CAA            Commonwealth Association of Architects
- CHE            Council on Higher Education
- HEQC           Higher Education Quality Committee
- RIBA           Royal Institute of British Architects
- SACAP          South African Council for the Architectural Profession
- SAIA           South African Institute of Architects
- SAQA           South African Qualifications Authority
- UIA            International Union of Architects
- UNESCO     United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization

## 1.2  Definitions

- Architectural Learning Site – a department of architecture at a university, university of technology, comprehensive university or private institution that, in many cases, has been referred to as a "school" in the past.
- Validation Panel – a pool of suitably qualified and approved persons from which members of a Visiting Board are drawn.
- Validation – the granting of approval/recognition to a course/programme /examination which has been tested and found to produce results of a minimum acceptable standard against set criteria (i.e. output related).
- Visiting Board – a team drawn from the Validation Panel and others who may be nominated by the SACAP or HEQC, as well as a representative appointed by the CAA.

## 1.3  Background, purpose statement, aim and objectives

Even though this could be regarded as a mere case of semantics, SACAP, in line with the terminology adopted by the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) and the Commonwealth Association of Architects (CAA), also uses the term "validation" in lieu of "accreditation". Accreditation, as conducted by the Council for Higher Education (CHE), focuses on procedures and processes, and although SACAP may comment on issues such as governance and administration, those are mainly the domain of the CHE.

Validation, on the other hand, is an evidence-led, peer-reviewed evaluation of courses in architecture. The definition offered by the International Union of Architects is quite apt (UIA and architectural education: Reflections and recommendations, 2008):

Validation is principally an "output" based assessment process. Accreditation, on the other hand, is principally an "input" based process.

SACAP judges the evidence presented by the ALS and revealed by interviewing staff, learners and external examiners. In addition, validation provides a benchmark in terms of international educational standard as well as allowing mobility of learners between the various programmes offered by ALS's.

Validation is conducted in South Africa by SACAP appointed Visiting Boards.

These visits are conducted every four years to coincide with the four-year term of office of the SACAP Councils – every ALS would be visited once during each council's term of office. It must be noted that Clause 13 of the Architectural Profession Act (Act 44 of 2000) also states that "If the council does not conduct an accreditation visit within that term of office, it must notify the Minister accordingly and provide him or her with reasons for the failure to do so".

In the broadest sense validation serves three **purposes**:
- The first is to determine whether graduates who apply for registration as candidates in any of SACAP's four professional categories – with qualifications from the ALS being visited – meet the minimum standards of competencies and skills associated with that category. A validated qualification enables graduates to register as Candidate Architectural Technologists, Candidate Senior Architectural Technologists and as Candidate Professional Architects and Professional Architects with SACAP after two years of in-service training and the passing of an examination in professional practice.
- The second is to assess the quality and relevance of qualifications leading to candidacy and eventual professional registration and practice.
- The third is to gauge the energy and efficiency with which the problems faced in practice and education are addressed – in other words, are the academics up to standard?

The **aim** of the validation system is simply the safeguarding of architectural education standards by means of a recognition process. Specific **objectives** are to:
- Recommend to SACAP that the qualification concerned meets the prescribed national standard for registration purposes for the category of registration concerned.
- Recommend to a variety of international validation authorities that the qualification concerned is compatible with international standards.
- Communicate the results of an accreditation visit to the Higher Education Quality Committee for the purpose of approval of accreditation and registration of qualifications on the National Qualifications Framework by South African Qualifications Authority.
- Offer practical help and provide advice and assistance regarding objectives and resources.

## 1.4 Validation criteria

In the past draughtspersons (also called technicians in some parts of the world) and architects operated in two symbiotic, but parallel streams, with the latter designing buildings and the former producing the technical documentation. Anybody could nevertheless design buildings up to 500 square metres in area, but only registered architects were allowed to do larger buildings.

The Architectural Profession Act (Act 44 of 2000) combined technologists and architects into a single continuum and the Identification of Work (IDoW) policy allows all categories of registration some design work based on the complexity of the project and the sensitivity of the site. The Act naturally had profound consequences.

The first was that architectural learning sites had to abandon the traditional five-year B Arch to provide the multiple exit levels demanded by the four categories of registration. Many educationalists are now questioning the wisdom of such a fragmented and modularised approach to the training of architects.

The second inevitable result had been that universities of technology have to teach more design and traditional universities have to teach more construction. Not only must this expanded brief be facilitated within the recognised five-year programme (six years in the case of TUT currently), but it must also fit into the ideological position of the university in relation to its vision. Because of this duality some programmes have inevitably (and understandably) became less focussed.

Therefore, although architectural learning sites are expected to maintain some balance, they are also expected to declare their priorities in this regard:
(1) Design at a very advanced scholarly level with less attention to (say) the production of contract documentation, or
(2) Design at a less philosophical – but still pragmatic and competent – level, but with an emphasis on the preparation of technical documentation – or presentation material – of outstanding quality.

Whatever the focus of the ALS, validation is nevertheless not the intuitive value judgement of standards. Two primary sets of validation criteria are applied.  The first is contained in SACAP's conspectus of architectural competencies (Appendix A, updated Jan 2010). It prescribes a range of competencies for each of the four categories of architectural professionals, which in turn are aligned with the qualifications under validation. Considering the contradictions described, some competencies are indicated as optional formal outcomes and as suitable for learning through either route. Visiting Boards must be sensitive to the diversity of philosophies and focuses described in the previous paragraph when rating subjects.

Since international benchmarking is an important aspect of the process, the criteria published by the Commonwealth Association of Architects (CAA) entitled *Qualifications in Architecture Recommended for Recognition by CAA: Procedures and Criteria* (Appendix B, part of the 'Green Book' issued in 2008) constitutes the second set of validation criteria.

It is clear, therefore, that although the validation process is standardised for consistency and equality, the intrinsic diversity of learning programmes is accepted and celebrated. The ALS under validation is expected to articulate and explain, very clearly, how its programme is positioned vis-à-vis existing programmes at other ALSs. Unique characteristics of the programme, its niche, as well as similarities and distinctive differences must be highlighted.

Visiting Boards must assess subjects in terms of structure, credits, content, teaching and learning, and intellectual intensity in terms of the year offered. An ALS must also indicate how continuity and vertical progression are to be achieved in the transition between qualifications. Of specific importance are the requirements for, and envisaged format of, final year design theses and their examination procedures. Ultimately, the Visiting Board must be convinced that the curriculum consists of at least 50 per cent design and that the postgraduate qualification is the culmination of at least five academic years of studying, with architectural history, theory, design and construction as the core subjects.

The priority of the CAA is to benchmark programmes against the criteria and standards required of Parts 1 and 2, rather than against what the qualifications are called or the periods of study. The CAA generally expects institutions seeking validation to identify where and how they believe these criteria and standards are met.

The CAA Green Book (p.11) states that the period of academic studies at Part 2 exits should be 'not less than the equivalent of five years of full-time studies' (as the UNESCO/UIA Charter for Architectural Education specifies). No minimum period to Part 1 is stipulated, given the various structures that exist worldwide although it usually equates to an undergraduate degree exit, which is normally three, or sometimes four years duration (depending on entry qualifications).

## 2   The Visiting Board

### 2.1  Composition and appointment

The members of the Visiting Board are drawn from a standing Validation Panel approved by the SACAP Council. The Board must consist of four registered architects and two academics, of which at least one must also be a registered architect. At least one member of a visiting board should provide continuity from the previous visit Architects are to be nominated by SAIA, and academics either by the ALS they work for or by the Heads of Schools Committee. In both instances preference should be given to those involved with external examinations at ALSs. International experience, as well as, race and gender diversity is strongly recommended in order to accord the process wider credibility and value. For the sake of succession and continuity the Board should also comprise members representing all age groups. In order to achieve consistency and rigour in the implementation of the revised procedures all panel members are required to attend a training course organised by SACAP.

The exclusion of persons registered in the other professional categories is regrettable but purely based on practical considerations – Visiting Board members must be familiar with the whole scope and spectrum of architectural competencies and responsibilities, and not with fragments thereof. In fact, it is arguably not ethically acceptable to allow persons registered in a particular category to assess the outputs expected from or produced by, an institution offering qualifications aligned with a higher category.

The principles governing the composition of a Visiting Board are sacrosanct. A Visiting Board will consist of at least:

- Two academics, active or retired (at least one must also be a registered architect);
- Four Professional Architects in practice, or retired (SAIA members);
- A CAA representative (SACAP's guest);
- One learner;
- SACAP's Board Secretary;
- The CHE may be invited to appoint a specialist in tertiary education to the board.

When planning a Visiting Board it should be considered that there are benefits in the Secretary remaining outside the direct evaluation process in order to focus on procedure and communication.

A member of an allied discipline in the built environment with relevant experience may also be invited to serve on a Board.

Relationships between institutions and agencies in South Africa are increasingly characterised by dialogue, transparency and consensus. SACAP's Validation Committee, therefore, identifies a Chairperson and members of a Visiting Board whose names are then forwarded to the Head of the ALS, who may object to the inclusion of a person on the proposed board because of a perceived conflict of interest or because of animosity in the past. The Head may also suggest the possible inclusion of board members, on condition that such an alternative member is already listed as a Validation Panellist. The Visiting Board Chairperson will be appointed by SACAP.  He or she may be either a prominent architect or experienced academic, and one with considerable experience of validation visits. Again the ALS may contest the choice of Chairperson, but that objection must be thoroughly motivated.

This spirit of openness and engagement must, however, not be abused and the SACAP Council must ultimately be convinced that Board members are independent, objective and knowledgeable individuals.

The CAA will be allowed to select its representative without having to consult with either SACAP or the ALS to be validated. In certain specific prearranged situations the CAA may also nominate a second member to the Board.

## 2.2   Duties of the Visiting Board Secretary

The Visiting Board Secretary is a key figure in the process, responsible for the prompt production of the Validation Report. For the sake of flexibility a number of options are available. All these options have been applied in the past, admittedly with varying degrees of success. As with other members of the Visiting Board, the ALS concerned may object to SACAP's particular choice.

The first option is to appoint a member of the SACAP Validation Committee, who will then also be entrusted with the management and smooth running of the visit, and as such will be the eyes and ears of SACAP at the visit, with a duty to report back to the Validation Committee on the visit. This person will conduct information and coordination session for Visiting Board members on objectives and procedures for the visit, as well as SACAP and CAA policies and protocols before the visit begins (Appendix C – Proposed agenda and briefing notes for validation visit pre-meetings). Guidance in these matters should also be provided during the visit.

The second is to utilise a SACAP staff member. If that person is also a registered architect, he/she will assume the responsibilities outlined above. If this person possesses a purely clerical background the Validation Committee may appoint one of its members to coordinate the visit, carry out the initial briefing of the Validation Board, and generally support the Chairperson in logistical matters. Since only Validation Committee members who are architects will be eligible for coordinating the visit, it will be up to the Chairperson to decide whether the coordinator must also contribute to the evaluation process.

The duties of the Visiting Board Secretary are as follows:

- Manage the visit with respect to time and arrangements with the Head of the ALS;
- Keep an attendance register;
- Keep records of meetings;
- Collect and collate information;
- Prepare declaration to be signed off and issued at the completion of the visit;
- Complete a report conforming to the SACAP approved format;
- Circulate draft reports for comment from Visiting Board Members, and ensure that a record is kept of such comments;
- Ensure compliance with the timetable and activities set out in Appendix D.


## 2.3  The Visiting Board's task

In essence the task of the Visiting Board is to determine whether the graduates of the ALS to be visited meet the required standards.  To this end the lowest standards allowing learners to qualify for graduation are of greatest concern.

The Visiting Board will be trained to objectively evaluate:

- The ALS's ability as demonstrated in the delivery of its course and the standard of achievement of learners;
- Whether or not the ALS's strategic objectives and the tactical aims of each academic year are valid, clearly defined, understood by staff and learners, and are effectively implemented;
- The content and coverage of the syllabuses and the relevance of lectures in relation to project work (put more plainly, are subjects and assignments logically integrated?)

Since design, technology, theory and history of architecture are the core subjects, the extent to which the courses develop skills and understanding in the learners is of particular interest:

- The ability to analyse and synthesise;
- Creativity in design;
- The ability generally to portray technically accountable and sustainable buildings;
- Sensitivity to the relation between a building and its context;
- An adequate knowledge of the history and theory of architecture, related arts, technologies and human sciences;
- The skills of communication with clients, contractors and other members of the building team;
- An adequate understanding of the legal, ethical, contractual and procedural aspects of professional architectural practice.

Appendix E may be helpful in guiding the evaluation of subjects, as well as providing records for future reference.

The information and coordination meeting the day before the Validation Visit commences is extremely important and Visiting Board members must ensure that they arrive on time. An outline agenda should include at least the following items:
- Methodology, aim and objectives of the Visiting Board;
- Evaluation of documentation;
- Review report of last visit and follow-up reports (if any);
- Discuss vision of the ALS and curriculum content;
- Review and identify matters to be clarified and investigated during the visit;
- Allocation of tasks amongst Board members.

## 3. Preparations for a Visiting Board

The Visiting Board wishes to observe an ALS as it normally operates, with lectures and studio work in progress. The preparation for a visit inevitably means extra work and SACAP is grateful for co-operation in this connection. A reason often offered for the ALS not operating normally during a visit, is that studio and other teaching space is needed for the exhibition of learner work. However, every effort should be made to identify space elsewhere in the vicinity for the examination of work by the Visiting Board.

The Head and staff of the ALS are expected to study this document in advance of the visit so that the operation of the Visiting Board is understood, and to give careful attention to the checklist of information and actions required as listed under heading 5 hereafter, and set out in more detail in Appendices F and G. In the preparation of material, care should be taken not to allow the medium to cloud the message. Attractive presentation is always appreciated, but should not be at the expense of clear expression and legibility. A visit may, at the discretion of the Board Chairperson, be aborted if documentation is not adequate.

The Visiting Board would like the visit to be treated as a co-operative exercise and, whilst the timetable is necessarily tight, its members will have received a great deal of information about the ALS to be visited in advance and it may be assumed that they are informed in respect of the working of the ALS.

The sequence and duration of activities set out in the time schedule may be changed in collaboration between the Visiting Board Chairperson, Coordinator/Secretary and the Head of the ALS, but must be finalised at least a month before the visit. The constraints of a tight timetable make last minute changes difficult if not impossible to accommodate.  The Board Chairperson will also have the right to abort the visit should unscheduled timetable changes interfere with the board's work or should information required before or during the visit not be available.  An ALS to be inspected is advised against a last minute team effort to assemble the necessary information.  Best results are often obtained when a single person collates the information, starting at least a semester before submission.

# 4  Arrangements for the visit

## 4.1  Administrative

Visiting Boards take place at a maximum of four yearly intervals.  The date for a Visiting Board is to be confirmed with the registrar of SACAP at least twelve months in advance and under normal circumstances will be in April. ALSs preparing to submit a new or existing course for initial validation are advised to request an informal advisory visit at least a year before an initial validation visit.

## 4.2  Financial

Previously the cost of accommodation and travel for SACAP appointed members of the Visiting Board was met by SACAP.  This not only placed an unfair burden on SACAP's registered persons since Validation Visits were financed by means of their annual fees, but was also akin in principle to, say, government paying for drivers' licences. In future the ALS to be validated will be responsible for financing a "licence to teach", in the form of a lump sum determined by SACAP.  This amount will cover the costs of deploying SACAP appointed members and is not intended to generate profit.

The CAA representative will be the guest of SACAP, who will finance that person's visit.

Either the ALS under validation (or SACAP if the institution does not have the capacity) arranges hotel accommodation, breakfast, dinner and transport for members of the Visiting Board, who make their own travel arrangements for which they may claim compensation. SACAP appointees, as well as the CAA representative, are entitled to a daily allowance (honorarium), the amount of which will be reviewed annually.

When representatives of other authorities, such as the CHE, join the Visiting Board that authority will bear the expenses incurred. Representatives of such authorities will have the status of observers and their presence will be subject to prior SACAP approval. The extent to which observers may participate in the process will be at the discretion of the Board Chairperson.

## 4.3  Logistical

The Visiting Board should be provided with a suitable, lockable, room in the ALS to use as a base, in which to keep members' papers and to hold private meetings. The Board prefers to have a simple working lunch at the ALS or where course work is displayed, giving an opportunity to see more of the staff and learners and to meet those individuals involved in management of the ALS.

Water must always be available. Beverages should be served mid-mornings and mid-afternoons. Because of time constraints, these must not interrupt the sessions. Neither SACAP nor the CAA is in favour of after hours' social functions. South Africans are hospitable people and most enjoy meeting on an informal basis. However, the validation process is very intense, and experience has shown that in order to maintain focus and discipline, evening socialising can be counter-productive. Evenings are needed for informal discussion and for Visiting Board members to relax. The scheduled working lunch for Board members and staff is the preferred alternative. While no after-hours social invitations from the ALS, staff or students will be accepted, informal socialising at the proposed exhibition of best work directly after the first day's proceedings is acceptable.

# 5    Checklist of material required

## 5.1  Four weeks in advance of the visit – report introducing the ALS

In the past ALSs tended to copy and courier to SACAP beforehand – for distribution to all members of the Visiting Board – at great expense and effort, not only the basic documentation requested by SACAP, but even the subject files. This is unnecessary and a single compact but comprehensive document distributed prior to the visit will suffice (Appendix G). SACAP will provide the relevant ALS with the contact information and delivery addresses (for courier purposes). Failure to submit the required documentation four weeks in advance of the visit may lead to the visit being aborted. Should documentation be incomplete or unclear, the Chairperson may, after consulting other board members, also abort the visit.

The said document is intended as an introduction to the ALS concerned, and should offer information on recent and envisaged developments, as well as information for orientation and assessment. The cover should identify the ALS and the higher education institution where it is located, the fact that the document is intended for a SACAP Validation Visit, as well as the date of the visit. It must have a table of contents.

Part One of the document is the customary "Critical Self-Appraisal", and addresses the items as listed in Appendix G. Part Two is essentially a response to the Questionnaire, again as set out in Appendix G. Part Three is a collection of

appendices or annexure that are too bulky for the main body of the text. Part Four presents a copy of the most recent Validation Report.

The Self Appraisal is intended to capture the nature and scope of the programme under validation, as well as the setting and circumstances – the "stage" for the academic programmes to be validated. It is also meant to reveal perceived strengths and weaknesses. Unnecessary information should be omitted and the focus must fall on conciseness and clarity. For example:

- The Self Appraisal tends to be rambling. Great care should be taken to ensure that it does not duplicate information presented elsewhere in the document. Where changes have been made the reader should be referred to the relevant section.
- Rather than containing full CVs of lecturers, short biographical sections should be presented.
- Rather than learner guides (which should be in the subject files at the ALS; see below), subjects should be briefly described in terms of aim and objectives, expected outcomes, credits, prerequisite subjects, and evaluation procedures. No more than half a page should be allocated to each subject.
- It is enormously helpful when the subjects are also listed in tabular form. The subjects offered in each year of the programme should be listed, again with their credit values (which should be totalled at the end of each year for the reader's convenience), together with information on the name of the lecturer(s), whether he or she is full- or part-time, highest qualification, as well as professional affiliations.
- An organogram showing the organisational structure and role players at the ALS is always helpful.
- The learners' report on the ALS should also be included in Part 3 of the document.
- The most effective documents to date have been in the 120 to 150 page range, printed on both sides (to reduce bulk), in A4 format (for transportability), and with very attractive layouts and images (to make reading more enjoyable!).

## 5.2  Available during the visit

- A representative range of studio work for all years of the course, exhibited chronologically with relevant programmes so as to show the development of the curriculum throughout the entire course:  drawings to be hung separately and consecutively with the exception of large sets of drawings which are best overlapped.  The line of demarcation between the work of each year should be clear;
- Portfolios of studio work undertaken during the previous twelve months of two top students, two averages and of the three students who achieved the lowest passes are required for each year of the course. These academic portfolios, which should be clearly labelled, should be available for reference in the room set aside for the Visiting Board.  In all cases the actual mark achieved must be displayed.  The Board will need to know by what margin the work concerned is a pass or failure;
- Design work, including the project brief, as well as the work upon which the final mark in every other subject in the final year of study was determined, makes up an academic portfolio;
- All examination question and answer papers for the semester immediately preceding the visit;

- In selecting the work for exhibition, the ALS is asked to display good, representative work in addition to that of the ablest learners. The sequence of the work shown should follow the sequence of the course with clear delineation between the works of differing years. The briefs and assessment criteria applicable to the work on display must be readily available;
- The reason for requesting low pass portfolios is that the Visiting Board's primary function is to evaluate minimum standards. For this reason it is important, from a benchmarking point of view, to give the actual percentage mark to enable the Board to understand by what margin the work was judged to have passed or failed;
- The work in the portfolios should be arranged in chronological order with clear and sensibly placed title lettering and with the relevant year programmes inserted. There should also be an explanation inserted for any work that is missing;
- Preparatory work as well as the final drawings should be included so as to reveal the learner's approach to projects and the reasons why one solution rather than another has been adopted;
- Examination scripts with the relevant question paper should be grouped in sets of related subjects for each year, with the ALS's usual mark sheets and external examiners' report attached to each set of papers.

All subject files must be available on request (they must be maintained and be up to date as a CHE requirement in any case) and should at least contain the following information:

- Learner guides and orientation documents;
- Assignment hand-outs and marks;
- External examiner/moderator reports;
- Lecturer evaluation forms;
- Attendance lists and medical certificates;
- Where possible, the majority of the presentations should be held in one room where all the previously mentioned material is available. This obviously excludes discussions with learners or staff where confidentiality is at stake.

# 6  Procedures for the visit

During the visit the Visiting Board meets with individuals and with groups. The Visiting Board's private talk with the Head after the presentation on the first morning of the visit is intended to afford an opportunity for the Head to bring any matters of concern to the Visiting Board's attention.

The presentation during the morning of the first day is aimed only at defining the ALS's benchmark for acceptable performance in each year of study. This is not to be regarded as an opportunity to display the ALS's best work. This presentation should focus on subjects that directly inform architectural design, with an indication of how courses develop from year to year and how courses are integrated with design teaching. It must be concluded by a profile of the lowest passes in design, with the work of each year introduced by the relevant studio staff. The presentation may be digital or by any other suitable means that the time constraint allows. The

work presented should be that of the academic year preceding the visit.
It is important that Visiting Board members be able to form an impression of the standards achieved by the end of each academic year. As the board is essentially concerned with the threshold standard, the design work shown must of necessity only be at lowest pass level. During the afternoon session there will be a full opportunity for board members to examine the best design work in each year.

The timetable provides for a meeting with some or, if possible, all of the ALS's external examiners. It would be helpful if they were able to join in the discussion with staff. A great deal of importance is attached to external examiners, their credibility and in particular to their presumed objective and unbiased assessment of the ALS's level of achievement. External examiners are assumed to have a greater depth of understanding of levels of achievement in their area of expertise than Visiting Board members, and detailed clarification will be required where their reports are unsatisfactory or where their assessment differs significantly from the internal examiners' assessment.

The Visiting Board's discussion with the staff is intended to be wide-ranging and it is hoped that all members of staff will join in. Discussion will also take place during the less formal encounters with staff in the studios or over lunch. Should any staff members wish to have personal discussions with the Visiting Board, they should contact the Chairperson. The Head should make it known that this opportunity is available to all staff members.

Members of the Visiting Board have a formal group discussion with learners as well as talking to individual learners in the studios. The discussion group may include representatives of each year or, at the discretion of the ALS, be open to any learner who wishes to be present.

If possible, some recently qualified graduates of the ALS other than those in teaching positions should be invited. This meeting is usually unstructured, but learners may, if they wish, prepare a brief list of topics to discuss with the Visiting Board. Preferably this should be made available to the Board on the first day. It is essential that learners and ex learners from the exit levels of the course under consideration should be represented.

# 7  Report and recommendations of the Visiting Board

The Visiting Board issues a written statement on completion of the inspection activities (see 7.6) and immediately thereafter prepares a full draft report to be handed over prior departure (see 7.7). These documents – the one in a summary form and the other parallel, but comprehensive – making recommendations as to whether or not courses and examinations at ALSs of architecture are of a standard to be recommended to SACAP for the purposes of registration in the categories currently allowed for in the Architectural Profession Act. The Visiting Board may also make recommendations to or in collaboration with other validation authorities with which SACAP has current agreements. Obviously these two documents must be precisely aligned.

Reports are outlined and formatted according to a SACAP template (Appendix H). Each report must contain a succinct executive summary that will also be published on the SACAP website and that the ALS may release verbatim to the press.

The executive summary will not only confirm the validation status of the qualifications submitted for validation, but also afford a holistic overview of the programmes. It should comment on the learners' knowledge, understanding and communication of design, theory, technology, as well as practice. A direct appraisal of assignments in general in terms of responsiveness to function, aesthetics, and physical and cultural context is essential. So is commentary on the ALS's contribution to local and regional concerns, including accessibility, social inclusiveness, ease of construction, climate and contextual responsiveness, and African identity and urbanism. Comments on the contribution of the ALS to the international discourse (if any) will certainly be appreciated.

In making the recommendations, the board may do so in terms of any of the following options in relation to the first stage, any other stage or the whole of a course.

## 7.1  An advisory visit

Where advice is sought prior to the implementation of a new course or stage of a course prior to initial validation.

## 7.2  Initial or Continued Validation

Where there has been a previous visit and validation of the courses, and examinations are adjudged to have maintained the necessary standards, validation is normally continued for four years. In the case of an initial visit a satisfactory assessment will also result in validation for four years.

Where aspects of the courses and/or examinations require some improvement, validation may be subject to conditions and remedial action to be taken, to be monitored by one or more of the following methods:

- A requirement for the ALS to make reports to SACAP each academic year;
- Submission to SACAP of all external examiners' reports annually until the next visit;
- Appointment of new (or more) external examiners;
- A visit at some specified future time by a sub-group (normally the Chair, Secretary, and one or two other members);
- A requirement that the ALS, in consultation with SACAP, should for a specified period appoint professional advisers who will report to SACAP;
- A revisit by a full Visiting Board in two years if, on the basis of evidence received that the necessary improvements have not been made within the specified timescale.

## 7.3  Withdrawal of Validation

Where courses and examinations are adjudged to have fallen below minimum standards, validation is withdrawn with effect with effect from the end of the academic session as appropriate, and which would take account of the learners already on the course.

## 7.4 Deferred Validation following an initial visit

Recommendations may be deferred until the ALS has fulfilled a particular requirement, for example:

- Provision of additional evidence (to be specified);
- Some members of the Visiting Board joining the external examiners at the end of year assessments to view the exhibition of the whole of the ALS's work and report back to SACAP.

## 7.5 A Re-Visit

Where conditional or deferred validation has been awarded or validation has been withdrawn, the purpose of a re-visit would be to revalidate or confirm full validation if an acceptable standard has been achieved.

## 7.6 A non-negotiable condition – Draft report to be completed before departure

The findings regarding validation status (the core recommendations to SACAP and the CAA), the essential conditions (if any) and recommendations to the ALS, as well as some of the most pertinent strengths and weaknesses, must be declared in a written and signed statement. SACAP prefers that these recommendations should be based on a consensus view and should therefore be signed off by all Visiting Board members.

The Visiting Board must then immediately proceed with the validation report in the format set out in Appendix H, expanding on the essential findings listed in the consensus statement. The report, in draft form, must be submitted to the HoD for factual checking before departure.

## 7.7 The validation report – timescales

The timescale and circulation sequence for the processing of the report will be as follows:

- The draft report MUST be submitted to the HoD on departure;
- The HoD is allowed seven days maximum for factual checking. During that period the Board Secretary may permit members to modify comments. For example, a member may decide rephrase a comment (for example, to tone down extremely harsh criticism), but the introduction of additional issues are not allowed at this stage;
- After making the changes suggested by the HoD and Board Members, and incorporating the HoD's letter (see Appendix H), the Board Secretary must have the report professionally language edited. SACAP will bear the costs of editing and assist in reformatting the report in instances where the Board Secretary is not fully capable;
- Preferably two weeks, but never more than one month after the visit the report is to be submitted to the SACAP Registrar who then submits the report to the SACAP Validation Committee, for approval on behalf of SACAP in terms of this Committee's delegated functions;
- To avoid delays the Validation Committee may agree through telephonic and/or e-mail correspondence (after giving due regard to both comment and appeals) request the Registrar to submit both the report and the committee's written response to Council for ratification.

- Six weeks after the visit the Registrar of SACAP forwards the report to any associated validation body, which body will be given two weeks to react to the findings of the report;
- Two months after the visit the Registrar will forward the final report to the head of the institution inspected. This report will in addition be forwarded to the CHE.

## 7.8  Settling of disputes and appeals

Validation is essentially a process of constructive engagement between peers and colleagues. Appeals should ideally be limited to matters of fact that may have been misrepresented and as such can be dealt with administratively by the Validation Committee.

SACAP's President will be the arbitrator should an ALS appeal against withdrawal of recognition. He/she may co-opt any number of Councillors to assist him/her in adjudicating the matter, and may also co-opt other parties who may be able to make an expert contribution.

# Appendix A – SACAP's competencies for validation

This appendix (updated 28 July 2012) describes the competencies required for each of the categories of architectural professionals as defined in terms of the Architectural Profession Act (Act 44 of 2000). It was compiled by the Standards Generating Body (SGB) for Architecture, and is intended as the interface between academia and practice. The document was informed by four interdependent considerations.

**First:** the essential skills and knowledge required to practise architecture in a sustainable, socially responsible and financially viable way are clustered into a range of ten specific outcomes. It would make the work of the Visiting Board significantly easier if the ALS under validation could indicate in a matrix how the competencies are integrated into the curriculum.

| CAA classification | Qualification(s) & SAQA Levels | Year of study with Subjects / courses | Architectural design | Environmental relationships | Construction technology | The structure of buildings | Contextual & urban relationships | Architectural history, theory & precedent | Building services & related technologies | Contract documentation & administration | Computer applications | Office practice, legal aspects & ethics |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| PART 1 | | 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| PART 2 | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | |

**Second:** the competencies were aligned with the envisaged Identification of Work Matrix. That matrix is based on the complexity of the project, and the sensitivity of the context and site, whether natural or constructed.

| | | | SITE SENSITIVITY | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | LOW | MEDIUM | HIGH |
| PROJECT COMPLEXITY | LOW | | PrArchDraught | | |
| | | | PrArchT | | |
| | | | PrSArchT | | |
| | | | PrArch | | |
| | MEDIUM | | PrArchT | | |
| | | | PrSArchT | | |
| | | | PrArch | | |
| | HIGH | | PrSArchT | | |
| | | | PrArch | | |

**Third:** the competencies attempt to establish a consistent framework, aligning and matching registration in one of the four categories of architectural professionals with the relevant qualifications. Higher education in South Africa is currently in the process of converting to the "new" Higher Education Qualifications Framework (HEQF) that was published in 2007 (Government Gazette No. 928 of 5 October 2007). The table below sets out the qualifications and National Qualifications Framework (NQF) level required for a learner to be allowed to register as a candidate in one of the four categories. Note that some qualifications require a year of work integrated learning before an applicant can be registered as a candidate.

The "old" and "new" HEQF are integrated in the table. The "old" NQF levels remain applicable for the moment. The "new" NQF dispensation is included for orientation and familiarisation. Qualification nomenclatures that will become obsolete with the implementation of the new HEQF are presented in italics.

**Qualifications in relation to categories of registration**

| CATEGORY Candidate Professional | Degree stream | Diploma stream | Credits (1 credit = 10 hrs) | "Old" NQF Level | "New" NQF Level |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Architect | M Arch (Prof) *B Arch (5-yr)* *M Tech (Prof)* | — | 660 cumulative minimum | 8 | 9 |
| Snr Technologist | B Arch (Prof) BAS Honours *B Tech (4-yr)* BAS + 1 yr WIL | Postgraduate Diploma | 480 cumulative minimum | 7 | 8 |
| Technologist | — | Advanced Dip | 360 cumulative minimum | 6 | 7 |
| | BAS *BSc Arch* | *Higher Dip* | | | |
| | — | Diploma *National Dip* | | 5 | 6 |
| | | Advanced Cert | + 1 yr WIL | | |
| | | | 240 cum. min. | | |
| Draughtsperson | — | Higher Cert *National Cert* | 120 + 1yr WIL | | 5 |

The fourth consideration is that the competencies must allow an architectural professional to compete and operate internationally. This required considerable benchmarking with competencies set out by other international validation agencies.

**The terminologies used for describing learning levels:**

| LEVEL | LEARNING LEVEL | DESCRIPTION |
|---|---|---|
| A | Awareness | Acquaintance with relevant concepts and methods, without necessarily being skilled to paraphrase information. |
| B | Knowledge | Familiarity with relevant information, without necessarily being skilled to see its fullest implication or application. |
| C | Understanding | Full assimilation and comprehension of information, and the skill to correctly paraphrase it and relate it to other situations, including its practical application. |
| D | Ability | Skill in analysing problems, identifying appropriate information for the accomplishment of tasks and to apply it to the solution of specific problems. |

Another, perhaps more legible, way of representing the required learning levels is to categorise the competencies and skills in relationship to the body of knowledge and expertise available and simply rate them from minimal, low and medium through to advanced.

**SACAP summary matrix of competencies**

| PROFESSIONAL CATEGORY | LEARNING LEVEL REQUIREMENTS PER CATEGORY | | Architectural design (1) | Environmental relationships (2) | Construction technology (3) | Building structures (4) | Contextual and urban relationships (5) | Architectural history, theory and precedent (6) | Building services and related technologies (7) | Contract documentation and administration (8) | Computer applications (9) | Office practice, legal aspects and ethics (10) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Professional Architect** | Advanced | A | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | | ▓ | ▓ | | ▓ | | ▓ |
| | Medium | B | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ |
| | Low | C | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ |
| | Minimal | D | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ |
| **Prof. Senior Arch. Technologist** | Advanced | A | | | | | | | | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ |
| | Medium | B | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ |
| | Low | C | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ |
| | Minimal | D | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ |
| **Prof. Arch. Technologist** | Advanced | A | | | | | | | | | ▓ | |
| | Medium | B | | | | | | | | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ |
| | Low | C | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ |
| | Minimal | D | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ |
| **Prof. Arch. Draughts-person** | Advanced | A | | | | | | | | | ▓ | |
| | Medium | B | | | | | | | | ▓ | ▓ | |
| | Low | C | | | | | | | | ▓ | | |
| | Minimal | D | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ | ▓ |

# Competencies for the architectural profession

| | CANDIDATE PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL SENIOR TECHNOLOGIST | | CANDIDATE PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECT | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | CAA Part 1 | ✓ | CAA Part 2 | ✓ |
| **1. Architectural design** | **FORMAL**<br>• Ability to do a competent design of a simple multi story building as well as long span structures, based on parameters and constraints developed through independent scientific research, which are sensitive to issues of environment and sustainability, as well as cultural issues in a responsible, appropriate and economical manner in an urban, a sub-urban or rural context.<br>• Ability to appraise and define the above mentioned architectural problem.<br>• Ability to prepare an appropriate concept.<br>• Ability to develop the design to an ultimate and rational conclusion.<br>• Ability to present the design synthesis in a logical manner**.** | | **FORMAL**<br>• Ability to do a competent building design of a complex nature, based on parameters and constraints developed through independent scientific research, which is sensitive to issues of environment and sustainability, as well as cultural issues in a responsible, appropriate and economical manner in an urban, a sub-urban or rural context.<br>• Ability to appraise and define a complex architectural problem.<br>• Ability to prepare an appropriate concept.<br>• Ability to develop the design to an ultimate and rational conclusion.<br>• Ability to present the design synthesis in a logical manner. | |
| **2. Environmental relationships** | **FORMAL**<br>• Understanding of the relationship between the natural and the built environment.<br>• Understanding of landscapes and environmental structures in basic terms in an analytical, constructive and critical manner.<br>• Knowledge of the basic spatial, functional and aesthetical aspects appropriate to landscape architecture | | **FORMAL**<br>• Understanding of the relationship between the natural and the built environment.<br>• Ability to evaluate landscapes and environmental structures in basic terms in an analytical, constructive and critical manner.<br>• Understanding of the basic spatial, functional and aesthetical aspects appropriate to landscape architecture | |
| **3. Construction technology** | **FORMAL**<br>• Understanding of construction methods and uses for materials related to simple multi story building<br>• Understanding of the demands of context, local resources and appropriate technologies that harmonise with the environment, which influence the construction of a building.<br>• Ability to develop durable, cost-effective, climate responsive construction details.<br>• Ability to conduct limited relevant research into construction methods and materials and the appropriate applications. | | **FORMAL**<br>• Ability to implement innovative application of construction methods and uses for materials related to multi-storey, multi-functional, complex building types.<br>• Ability to recognise the demands of context, local resources and appropriate technologies that harmonise with the environment, which influence the construction of a building.<br>• Ability to develop durable, cost-effective, climate responsive construction details.<br>• Ability to conduct advanced research into construction methods and materials and the appropriate applications. | |

| | CANDIDATE PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL SENIOR TECHNOLOGIST | | CANDIDATE PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECT | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **CAA Part 1** | ✓ | **CAA Part 2** | ✓ |
| **4. Building structures** | **FORMAL**<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of the basic structural concepts pertaining to buildings.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to integrate structure and building design. | | **FORMAL**<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of structural concepts pertaining to buildings.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to integrate structure and building design.<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of calculations on the structural aspects of buildings. | |
| **5. Contextual & urban relationships** | **FORMAL**<br>• <u>Knowledge</u> of critical urban issues.<br>• <u>Awareness</u> of and sensitivity to urban aspects when designing individual buildings. | | **FORMAL**<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of the basic spatial, functional and aesthetical aspects appropriate to urban design.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to evaluate urban environments in very basic terms in an analytical, constructive and critical manner.<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of and sensitivity to urban aspects when designing individual buildings**.** | |
| **6. Architectural history, theory & precedent** | **FORMAL**<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of architectural history and theory.<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of the principles of learning from historical precedent.<br>• <u>Awareness</u> of the built environment and <u>understanding </u>of structures an analytical and constructive, critical manner.<br>• <u>Knowledge</u> of the basic spatial and aesthetical aspects appropriate to architecture.<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of research processes in architectural theories. | | **FORMAL**<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of architectural history and theory as part of a wider natural, social, technological and cultural system.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to evaluate and analyse the built form critically in complex terms.<br>• <u>Understanding </u>of the principles of learning from historical precedent.<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of social, ethical, spatial and aesthetical aspects of the environment.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to conduct relevant research in architectural theories. | |
| **7. Building services & related technologies** | **FORMAL**<br>• <u>Understanding </u>of the integration of the various technological aspects relating to services in one cohesive design.<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of the building regulations pertaining to all building services.<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of the following technological aspects and building services –<br><br>Drainage and water reticulation.<br>Electrical and electronic services and lighting.<br>Communications.<br>Air and gas supply.<br>Heating and cooling.<br>Elevators and escalators.<br>Fire protection and control.<br>Acoustics and sound systems. | | **FORMAL**<br>• <u>Ability </u>to integrate the various technological aspects relating to services in one cohesive design and find technological solutions.<br>• <u>Understanding </u>of the building regulations pertaining to all building services.<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of the following technological aspects and building services –<br><br>Drainage and water reticulation.<br>Electrical and electronic services and lighting.<br>Communications.<br>Air and gas supply.<br>Heating and cooling.<br>Elevators and escalators.<br>Fire protection and control.<br>Acoustics and sound systems. | |

| | CANDIDATE PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL SENIOR TECHNOLOGIST | | CANDIDATE PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECT | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **CAA Part 1** | ✓ | **CAA Part 2** | ✓ |
| **8. Contract documentation & administration** | **FORMAL**<br>• <u>Ability</u> to produce a set of working drawings as part of a set of contract documents of a complex building to acceptable practice standards.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to develop durable, cost-effective, climate-responsive construction systems and details sensitive to the contextual language of the design concept.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to do component and material specification<br>• <u>Understanding of</u> the relevance of applicable appropriate National Building Regulations (NBR) as well as the requirements of the NHBRC.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to respond to local authority approval requirements and procedures. | | **FORMAL**<br>• <u>Ability</u> to produce a comprehensive set of contract documents of a complex building to acceptable practice standards.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to develop durable, cost-effective, climate-responsive construction systems and details.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to recognise the demands of context and local resources and appropriate technologies that harmonise with the environment.<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of issues of sustainability of the built environment and <u>ability</u> to be able to evaluate materials in an ethical and socially responsible manner.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to do component and material specification<br>• <u>Ability</u> to implement appropriate National Building Regulations (NBR) as well as the requirements of the NHBRC.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to respond to local authority approval requirements and procedures. | |
| **9. Computer applications** | **FORMAL**<br>• <u>Understanding</u> of the range of computer technology presently in use in architectural practice and <u>ability</u> to apply it in the execution of work. Computer software to include web browsers and communication programs, word processing, spreadsheets, data bases, architectural drawing, 3 dimensional modelling, graphic and image editing programs.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to design, publish and maintain a website.<br>• <u>Knowledge</u> of different computer hardware solutions for networking.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to make informed decisions in the acquisition of networking hardware.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to troubleshoot network problems on a basic level.<br>• <u>Knowledge</u> of operating systems for networked machines, and, in particular, setting up work groups, setting permissions and data security.<br>• <u>Ability</u> to troubleshoot, upgrade and maintain PCs at a basic level. | | **FORMAL**<br><u>Understanding</u> I of the range of computer technology presently in use in architectural practice and …<br><br>**FORMAL/WORK INTEGRATED LEARNING**<br><u>Ability</u> to apply it in the execution of work. Computer software to include web browsers and communication programs, word processing, spread-sheets, databases, architectural drawing, 3 dimensional modelling, graphic and image editing programs. | |

| | CANDIDATE PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECTURAL SENIOR TECHNOLOGIST | | CANDIDATE PROFESSIONAL ARCHITECT | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **CAA Part 1** | ✓ | **CAA Part 2** | ✓ |
| **10. Office practice, legal aspects and ethics** | **FORMAL**<br>• Understand the terminology and basic concepts and principles of architectural practice.<br>• Understand all the regulatory and legal aspects of the profession.<br>• Knowledge of the contents of the various building contracts and the SAIA practice manual.<br><br>**FORMAL/WORK INTEGRATED LEARNING**<br>• Understand the terminology and basic concepts and principles of business practice.<br>• Understand the administrative and logistical support systems in a practice.<br>• Understand the basic concepts of business structures and principles, pertaining to architectural profession.<br>• Ability to design a feasible information access and retrieval system.<br>• Ability to design a functional and integrated management system.<br>• Ability to participate meaningfully in the management and administration of a building project.<br>• Ability to set up and run a building project successfully | | **FORMAL**<br>• Ability to apply all the regulatory and legal aspects of the profession.<br>• Ability to implement the contents of the various building contracts and the SAIA practice manual.<br><br>**FORMAL/WORK INTEGRATED LEARNING**<br>• Ability to apply the basic concepts of business structures and principles, pertaining to architectural profession.<br>• Ability to design a feasible information access and retrieval system.<br>• Ability to design a functional and integrated management system.<br>• Ability to implement administrative and logistical support systems in a practice.<br>• Ability to design marketing strategy.<br>• Ability to participate meaningfully in the management and administration of a building project.<br>• Ability to set up and run a building project successfully. | |

# Appendix B – CAA Validation Criteria

Qualifications in Architecture Recommended for Recognition by CAA: [Validation] Procedures and Criteria

| A.1 | CHARACTERISTICS REQUIRED OF SCHOOLS WITH VALIDATED COURSES | ✓ |
|---|---|---|
| A.1.1 | Normally the school should be in or associated with an institution of high academic level, preferably of university standard which can provide the wide range of studies required for the education and training of an architect. | |
| A.1.2 | The organisation of the school should allow for flexibility in the development of the course to meet the changing needs of architectural education. The school should have an identifiable management structure that ensures highly qualified architectural expertise is central in leadership and decision making. | |
| A.1.3 | The school should have the necessary facilities and financial support to achieve the physical, library and computing context in which it can attain its objectives. | |
| A.1.4 | There should be evidence that the school is involved in understanding the environmental problems of its community and that it is endeavouring to make contributions to their solutions through the study of real problems. | |
| A.1.5 | The staff profile should be of a high level of academic attainment and teaching ability and provide the necessary range of specialist skills and academic and practice experience. A school should encourage continuing research by staff or involvement in appropriate practice. Research should be regarded as an inherent activity of architectural teachers. Research may be founded on practice project work or relate to building construction. It may be integrated with teaching or it may relate to academic disciplines. | |
| A.1.6 | In general a school should have an entrance level which should not be below university entry or its equivalent. | |
| A.1.7 | The school should support gender and racial equity of opportunity for access to architectural education. | |
| A.1.8 | Students should have the opportunity to make positive contributions to the manner in which the school functions and there should be evidence of the method of ensuring good student/staff contact, not only in the teaching but in the general administration of the informal activities of the school. | |
| A.1.9 | The school needs to have systems for self-evaluation and peer review conducted at regular intervals, including in the review panel, teachers from other schools and practising architects. | |
| A.1.10 | Where appropriate, the school should facilitate staff and student exchanges with other schools, study visits, exhibitions of work and taking part in international competitions. | |

| A.2 | VALIDATED COURSES | ✓ |
|---|---|---|
| A.2.1 | Validated courses of study must be balanced between the theoretical and practical aspects of architectural training and shall ensure the acquisition of: | |
| A.2.1.1 | an ability to create comprehensive architectural designs that satisfy aesthetic, cultural, functional and technical requirements and are sustainable, and the ability to translate such designs into construction documents; | |
| A.2.1.2 | adequate personal and professional skills including communication (written, oral, aural, graphic, electronic, etc), information technology, personal effectiveness, problem-solving, and teamwork (including working with other disciplines and non-professionals); | |
| A.2.1.3 | an adequate knowledge of the history and theories of architecture and the related arts, technologies and human sciences; | |
| A.2.1.4 | a knowledge of the fine arts as an influence on the quality of architectural design; | |
| A.2.1.5 | an adequate knowledge of urban design, planning and the skills involved in the planning process; | |
| A.2.1.6 | an understanding of the relationship between people and buildings, and between buildings and their environment, and of the need to relate buildings and the spaces between them to human needs and scale with adequate knowledge of the means to produce safe environments accessible to people of varying physical and mental abilities; | |
| A.2.1.7 | an adequate knowledge of the means of achieving environmentally sustainable design; | |
| A.2.1.8. | an understanding of the profession of architecture and the role of the architect in society, in particular, in preparing briefs that take account of social factors; A.2.1.9 an understanding of the methods of investigation and preparation of the brief for a design project; | |
| A.2.1.10 | an understanding of the structural design, constructional and engineering problems associated with building design; | |
| A.2.1.11 | an adequate knowledge of physical problems and technologies and of the function of buildings so as to provide them with internal conditions of comfort and protection against the climate; | |
| A.2.1.12 | the necessary design skills to meet the requirements of clients and building users within the constraints imposed by cost factors and building regulations; | |
| A.2.1.13 | an adequate knowledge of the industries, organisations, regulations and procedures involved in translating design concepts into buildings and integrating plans into overall planning; | |
| A.2.1.14 | an adequate knowledge of project financing and cost control; | |
| A.2.1.15 | an adequate knowledge of procurement processes in the construction industry including building contracts and documentation. | |
| A.2.2 | Architectural students should be made critically aware of the political and financial motivations behind clients' briefs and building regulations in order to foster an ethical framework for decision-making within the built environment. Graduates in architecture should be sensitive to differences in gender, culture and customs, and be encouraged to assume responsibility as professionals in society. | |

| A.2.3 | Educational programmes should promote architectural design which considers the cost of future maintenance, also taking into account that, unlike traditional construction methods with low maintenance materials, some contemporary, experimental and unproved industrial systems and materials require constant and expensive maintenance. | |
|-------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| A.2.4 | Design project work is the basic means of architectural education and projects, including teacher/student dialogue, must form a substantial part of the learning period and occupy at least half of the curriculum. Design project work is normally undertaken in a studio setting conducive to peer and tutor support. | |
| A.2.5 | The education should be formalised by an examination at the end of the programme of studies, the principal part being an individual presentation and defence of an architectural project demonstrating the acquired knowledge and concomitant skills. For this purpose, review panels (i.e. 'crits' or 'juries') should include practising architects and teachers from other schools and, if possible, from other countries. | |
| A.2.6 | The balanced acquisition of the necessary design capabilities, knowledge and skills requires maturation; the period of academic studies in architecture should be normally not less that the equivalent of five years of full-time studies in a university or an equivalent institution, plus two years' experience in an architectural practice of which one may be obtained prior to the conclusion of academic studies. | |
| A.2.7 | The CAA encourages diversity through support for programmes of related studies which, for example, link architecture with other subjects, e.g. planning, management, engineering, etc, in a combined course; emphasise research; encourage particular teaching methods; develop specialisations within architecture; and promote advanced degrees. The CAA is keen to foster variety in architecture programmes which embrace breadth and depth of studies and have local/regional/global relevance. Schools are also encouraged to allow students to participate in a range of option studies outside the architectural programme, for example, establishing proficiency in another language. | |
| A.2.8 | the CAA considers that a research-teaching nexus will help strengthen graduate capabilities and thereby the profession's future relevance and standards. Encouragement is given for research and teaching to be linked in architectural design. Students undertaking research under staff guidance may contribute to generating a clearer understanding of knowledge that underpins design decisions. Explicit criteria that guides design development and evaluation can assist communication of better designs. In a research-teaching nexus academics can share their own disciplinary research with students, thereby teaching research methods, and academics can actively involve students in carrying out research of relevance to the discipline. | |
| A.2.9 | Encouragement is given to include opportunity for 'live' and community development projects in validated courses. Such project focus is seen as appropriate to achieve user oriented cultural and social sensitivity and understanding of the architect's role and responsibilities to their community. | |

# Appendix C – Pre-meeting Agenda

Proposed agenda and briefing notes for validation visit pre-meetings

| NO | AGENDA ITEM | NOTES & COMMENTS |
|----|-------------|------------------|
| 1. | Welcome | • Welcome [1]<br>• Introductions<br>• Personal |
| 2. | Confirmations | • Conflict of Interest<br>• Confidentiality Agreement [2]<br>• Contact info, qualifications & affiliations<br>• Authority and roles [3]<br>• Honorariums<br>• Agreement on completion of report [4] |
| 3. | Administrative & logistical arrangements | • Travel home [5]<br>• Accommodation<br>• Local travel<br>• Punctuality [6]<br>• After hour arrangements [7] |
| 4. | Background and orientation | • Act 44 of 2000<br>• Review of previous validation report<br>• Review of introductory document<br>• Validation schedule<br>• Time management |
| 5. | The need for a holistic approach | • Validation *versus* accreditation [8]<br>• Design *versus* construction [9]<br>• Diversity [10] |
| 6. | Clarification of purpose and potentially relevant validation outcomes | • Initial or Continued Validation [11]<br>• An advisory visit<br>• Withdrawal of Validation<br>• Deferred Validation following an initial visit<br>• A Re-Visit [12] |
| 7. | Recapping the process | • Purple Book [13]<br>• Competencies for the Architectural Profession |
| | Essential elements | • The focus of the process is the lowest pass<br>• HoD and staff to brief properly<br>• Interviews & group discussions extremely valuable<br>• Exhibitions [14]<br>• Portfolios [15]<br>• Nothing to be taken for granted [16] |
| 8. | Collating commentary | • Allocation of responsibilities [17]<br>• Capturing information [18]<br>• Compiling the interim and final reports |

| NO | AGENDA ITEM | NOTES & COMMENTS |
|----|-------------|------------------|
| 9. | Interim report on departure | • Statement regarding validation recommendation [19]<br>• List conditions and/or recommendations<br>• All members to sign off [20] |
| 10. | Additional matters, questions and closure | • Clarify and/or discuss [21] |

## NOTES

1   The Chairperson of the Visiting Board will also chair this meeting, assisted by the Board Secretary and/or the SACAP Coordinator.

2   While the validation process is intended to be as transparent as possible, Board Members are not allowed to discuss any aspect related to the proceedings with anybody outside the Board. Neither are they allowed to discuss the details of the visit with anybody until the final report is released.

3   The ultimate authority during the visit is vested in the Chairperson. For example, he/she has the authority to cancel the visit if (say) relevant information is not available. The Validation Coordinator or Board Secretary is responsible for timekeeping, and Chairpersons are requested to support timekeeping for the sake of order and discipline.

4   Due to embarrassment the late completion of validation reports has caused in the past, no honorarium will be paid out until the report has been finalized.

5   Board Members must ensure that their arrangements for travelling home after the visit are in order, including airport transfers.

6   Because of the need to respect the time schedule punctuality is crucial. If a Board member is late (for whatever reason) the other members should proceed according to schedule.

7   The architectural learning site under validation is not allowed to entertain the Visiting Board after hours. The members should use the opportunity to compare notes, discuss the events of the day and perhaps to consolidate commentary. Because a typical day during a validation visit can be very intense and demanding, Board members are usually keen to get a good night's rest and tend to prefer to go to bed early.

8   For the purpose of the SACAP process Validation is considered a peer review system looks at the outcomes of an architectural learning programme. Accreditation is about the process and content.

9   The Architectural Profession Act has squeezed technologists and architects into a single continuum and the Identification of Work policy allows all categories of registration some design work. The inevitable result has been that universities of technology have to teach more design and traditional universities have to teach more construction. Since this expanded brief has to be facilitated within the recognised five-year programme (six-years in the case of TUT currently), some programmes have inevitably became less focussed, Architectural learning sites are, therefore, expected to declare their priorities in this regard.

10   Diversity is also being validated. Every architectural learning site is expected to assume an unambiguous position regarding the locality of its programme within the local, regional, national and international milieus and debates.

11  Conditional validation should be recommended with great circumspection. In the past, Visiting Boards have recommended conditional validation because it was assumed that architectural learning sites would benefit from the supposed leverage. As it turned out, conditional validation has generally not only failed to elicit the institutional support hoped for, but the institutions' reputations have often been compromised. Conditional validation should only be recommended when the graduates of the learning site under validation clearly demonstrate that they lack the skills and competencies required for registration as a candidate in a professional category.

12  In the case of a re-visit new issues must not be opened. The focus is the issues highlighted in the previous validation report.

13  All members must be thoroughly familiar with both the Purple Book and the Competencies for the Architectural Profession.

14  The exhibition must present an overview of the studio work – examples of every project in every year – arrange chronologically examples of best, medium, minimum standards (at least one).

15  This aspect comprises selected portfolios of individual students across all subjects, and must include at least three constituting the lowest pass, and two in the medium category.

16  If the required documents are not available they should be requested. Failure to have critical information available at the onset is already awkward. Failure to produce such information on request could impact negatively on the outcome of a validation visit.

17  It is customary to allocate subjects to members (either individually or in teams) according to interest, expertise and validation experience. The subject streams are (1) design, (2) history and theory, (3) construction and technology, and (4) supporting subjects. It is important that supporting subjects must not be neglected, since these include professional practice, CAD and presentation training, landscape architecture and urban design, as well as other enriching subjects that underpin the vision and strategic objectives of the architectural learning site concerned.

18  The procedures for supporting the secretary in collating the information must be clearly set out. It was found that a pro forma for comments on a subject is a valuable process for putting observations and commentary on record. The ideal is that each board member types his/her contributions at the end of each day and hand it to the secretary. The secretary, using template, can then immediately insert the various sections. The best results are achieved if this process is completed each day before dinner.

19  The interim report should contain the essential decision regarding validation, as well as the most pertinent strengths and weaknesses. These form the framework for the subsequent report and should include all the pertinent recommendations. The final report may not introduce new issues.

20  Ideally the Visiting Board should sign off on a consensus report, but if that is not possible the judgment of the majority will prevail. However, dissenting members must be identified and their views recorded.

21  If a Visiting Board consists of experienced members the pre-meeting can conceivably be concluded in an hour or less. If some members are inexperienced as far as validation is concerned the process can take as much as three hours, since both the Purple Book and the Competencies for the Architectural Profession must then be discussed section by section.

# Appendix D – Recommended timetable

It must be emphasised that the timetable below is not mandatory, although it has become the customary sequence of events. The only compulsory arrangement is that the Head of the ALS concerned and the Chair of the relevant Visiting Board must be in agreement. The Chairperson may, for instance, suggest that learners be interviewed even prior to the presentation of the programme.

And although the Visiting Board may not be entertained in the evenings, an exhibition at the end of the first day where the ALS can show off its best work (possibly with a glass of wine) would be perfectly in order. An opportunity to informally discuss the best work with the lecturers could clarify the prevalent teaching philosophy and the scope for development of learners.

| TIME | ACTIVITY | PERSON/S INVOLVED |
|---|---|---|
| **DAY BEFORE FIRST DAY OF VISIT – Normally Sunday** | | |
| 16:00 | Pre-meeting of the Visiting Board. Chairperson to preside assisted by Visiting Board Secretary or Coordinator | Board |
| **FIRST DAY – Normally Monday** | | |
| 07:30 | Board to be collected at Guest House | |
| 08:00 - 08:20 | Introduction by Board Chairperson of Board members and by Head of ALS of staff members | Board, HoD and Staff |
| 08:30 - 09:00 | Courtesy meeting with the Vice-Chancellor & Principal | Board, |
| 09:00 - 12:00 | Presentation by staff of the outline of the programme and of core subjects that directly inform architectural design. To include 30 minute refreshment break. | HoD, Board, Lecturers |
| 12:00 - 13:00 | Private meeting with head of ALS (to include brief orientation tour of premises where necessary) | HoD, Board |
| 13:00 - 14:00 | Lunch with Head and staff who teach in Arch Programme | Staff and Board |
| 14:00 - 17:00 | Members of the Visiting Board divide their time between inspection of portfolios and other exhibited work. Visits to workshops, library, studios, computer facilities etc. including informal discussion with staff and learners. | Board |
| 17:15 – 18:00 | Exhibition of best work and informal socialising | Board and Staff |
| 18:15 | Board departs to Guest House | Board |
| **SECOND DAY – Normally Tuesday** | | |

| TIME | ACTIVITY | PERSON/S INVOLVED |
|---|---|---|
| 07:30 | Board to be collected at Guest House | |
| 08:00 – 09:00 | The Visiting Board divides into groups to interview staff that present support subjects. Samples of projects and exam scripts must be available. | Board & All support subject Staff |
| 09:00 – 10:00 | Meeting with Full Time and Part Time Staff without the Head of ALS unless invited by the Visiting Board Chairperson | Board and Staff |
| 10:00 – 10:30 | Refreshment break | Board |
| 10:30 – 11:30 | Meeting with Learners and Alumni | Board and Learners |
| 11:45 – 12:45 | Meeting with external examiners | Board and external examiners |
| 13:00 – 14:00 | Lunch meeting with Dean plus External Examiners | Board, Dean, External examiners |
| 14:00 – 15:00 | Presentation of what the ALS regards as its unique characteristics. | Board and Staff |
| 15:00 – 18:00 | Private meeting of Visiting Board to agree on general findings and report content. Draft statement. | Board |
| 18:00 | Depart for accommodation | Board |
| **THIRD DAY – Normally Wednesday** | | |
| 07:30 | Board to be collected at Guest House | |
| 08:00 – 10:45 | Work on report. Prepare for meeting with the DVC Finalise, print and sign off statement. | Board |
| 11:00 – 11:30 | Meeting with DVC and Dean to convey essential findings and hand over statement. | Board, DVC, Dean |
| 11:45 – 12:15 | Private meeting with Head of ALS to convey essential findings.<br><br>Then with staff and interested learners to hand over statement. No discussion is allowed at this point. | Board, HoD, Staff, Learners |
| 12:30 – | Depending on Visiting Board Members' completion of the Report and travelling arrangements<br><br>Submit draft report to Head of ALS for factual checking | Board |

# Appendix E – Commentary on assessment of a subject

**ASSESSMENT OF (Subject)** ...................................................................................................... .

| Rating scale: 1 = Inadequate; 2 = Not quite adequate; 3 = Adequate; 4 = Better than adequate; 5 = Excellent | | |
|---|---|---|
| **ASPECT** | **COMMENTS / ADVICE** | **RATING (1-5)** |
| Points arising from the Self Appraisal, responses to previous Visiting Board Reports and external examiners' comments | | |
| Clarity, validity and achievement of course objectives | | |
| Quality and coverage of the syllabus (including balance and integration between design / non-design work) | | |
| Progression within the course [or subject] | | |
| Assessment methods and coverage, commenting separately on exams, dissertations, design projects, assignments and external examining | | |
| Teaching and learning methods | | |
| Practical training arrangements [if applicable] | | |
| Comments based on learner statistics and interviews | | |
| Comments based on staff interviews | | |
| Resourcing and facilities | | |
| Alignment with SACAP competencies | | |
| Alignment with CAA validation criteria | | |

**Name of Validation Board member :** ...................................................................................

# Appendix F – Action Plan

SACAP Validation Visit Preparations: Action programme and events

| NO | ITEM / EVENT | COMMENTS |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Visit coordinator & report editor | |
| 2 | Travel, local transport & accommodation | Plus student assistants to be appointed |
| 3 | On-site meals & refreshments | |
| 4 | Secure workspace | ▪ Quiet, peaceful<br>▪ Coffee, tea, water<br>▪ Laptop & printer<br>▪ Sufficient work space |
| 5 | Report introducing the ALS | See Appendix G |
| | Language editing of report | |
| | Repro, binding and submission [CDs too] | Finalised document due |
| 6 | PowerPoint outlining programme | The presentation during the morning is aimed only at defining the ALS's benchmark for acceptable performance in each year of study.<br><br>This presentation should focus on subjects that directly inform architectural design, with an indication of how courses develop from year to year and how courses are integrated with design teaching.<br><br>It must be concluded by a profile of the two lowest passes in design, with the work of each year introduced by the relevant studio staff<br><br>Presentation:<br>▪ subjects vertical progression<br>▪ then design progression<br>▪ then work per year<br>Rehearse to check duration |
| 7 | PowerPoint presentation of unique characteristics | Rehearse to check duration |

| NO | ITEM / EVENT | COMMENTS |
|---|---|---|
| 8 | Subject files<br><br>• Learner guides & orientation documents<br><br>• Assignment hand-outs & mark<br><br>• External examiner/moderator reports<br><br>• Lecturer evaluation forms<br><br>• Attendance lists & medical certificates | |
| 9 | Exhibition | A collection of portfolios grouped per year and arranged by subject of the three lowest passes, two averages and two top students.<br><br>Subject files are part of this exhibition and assignment briefs, mark sheets and external examiners' reports must be readily available.<br><br>Portfolios must be clearly labelled, to indicate whether they are "lowest passes" or "average" or "top students".<br><br>In all cases the actual mark achieved must be displayed.<br><br>The exhibition should be either in the same room as that allocated to the Visiting Board, or in close proximity. |
| 10 | Interviews<br><br>1. Students, past & present<br><br>2. External examiners<br><br>3. Permanent staff<br><br>4. Specialist part-time staff | |
| 11 | Appointments with management<br>1. Dean & Associate Dean<br>2. VC & DVC | |
| 12 | Monday Sun downer social | |

# Appendix G – Document introducing the ALS

| NO | CONTENTS | COMMENTS |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Editor | 120 to 150 page range |
| 2 | Cover design | |
| 3 | Typography and illustrations | |
| **4** | **PART 1 – SELF-APPRAISAL** | |
| | ▪ Response to previous SACAP report and changes introduced to improve the courses since the last visit<br><br>▪ Effects of changes in resource provisions since the last visit<br><br>▪ Branding and intellectual identity<br><br>▪ Structure of the programme vis-à-vis the new Higher Education Qualifications Framework? [Appendix A – Programme Structure and the HEQF]<br><br>▪ Strategic objectives of each of the qualifications offered<br><br>▪ The ALS's perception of its own strengths and weaknesses [Appendix B – Report by student body]<br><br>▪ Staff/learner ratio (SLR)<br><br>▪ Provision for staff development<br><br>▪ Transformation initiatives<br><br>▪ Relationships with parent institution and other departments<br><br>▪ Linkages with other departments/faculties, tertiary institutions and research agencies, locally and internationally<br><br>▪ The future: Details of courses and facilities planned | Aim for 2,000 words max |
| **5** | **PART 2 – RESPONSE TO QUESTIONNAIRE** | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6 | A. <u>Learner recruitment, selection and admission</u><br><br>▪ Are learners assisted by the ALS in their career selection? Does the ALS provide information on Architecture as a career choice?<br><br>▪ How are prospective learners selected and admitted? Are there limits set on numbers of entrants? Is there an equity policy for learner admission? | |
| 7 | B. <u>Course structures and curriculum contents</u><br><br>▪ State the full official titles of the qualifications awarded and the length of each qualification.<br><br>▪ List the subject titles for each year of the course [Appendix C – Core syllabi] | |
| 8 | C. <u>Teaching and assessment</u><br><br>▪ Provide a list of all design projects in each year [Appendix D – Design projects]<br><br>▪ How is subject course work coordinated and integrated with design project work?<br><br>▪ Describe the ALS's teaching methods, including the use of visiting critics etc.<br><br>▪ What are the teaching methods for courses relating to Professional Practice in each of the qualifications?<br><br>▪ Describe the methods by which Information Technology is utilised in the teaching process.<br><br>▪ Describe briefly the method of assessing learners' work.<br><br>▪ Give the names of the external Examiners [Appendix E – External Examiners] | |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 9 | D. <u>Staff provisions</u> [All of following in tabular form, landscape, full- and part-time separately]<br><br>List teaching staff under the following headings:<br><br>▪ Name and date of appointment<br><br>▪ Full time or part time status<br><br>▪ Grade<br><br>▪ Academic qualifications<br><br>▪ Responsibility or subject(s) taught<br><br>▪ Practice consultancy or research detail<br><br>▪ Optional passport-sized photograph<br><br>List technical and administrative staff under the following headings:<br><br>▪ Name<br><br>▪ Date appointed<br><br>▪ Grade<br><br>▪ Function<br><br>▪ To whom responsible<br><br>▪ Please include a photograph | | |
| 10 | E. <u>Research and postgraduate studies</u><br><br>Outline the research programme and achievements of the ALS over the past four years, particularly by way of external funding, focus areas, graduates from research programmes, and staff publications [Appendix F – Status of Prof. Master's Programme] [Appendix G – Research Outputs] | | |
| 11 | F. <u>Finance</u><br><br>▪ Provide the current budget of the ALS and how it is spent.<br><br>▪ Has this changed significantly since the ALS was last visited? Highlight these changes by way of example/s. | | |
| 12 | G. <u>Management structure</u><br><br>Show diagrammatically the management structure of the ALS | An organogram showing the organisational structure and role players at the ALS | |

| 13 | H. Meetings with management<br>Give names of vice-chancellors, directors, administrators, heads of other departments or any other members of management whom the Visiting Board may meet. | Optional if indicated on programme |
|---|---|---|
| 14 | I. Resources and facilities<br><br>▪ Library<br> Provide an outline of the academic support given by the Institution and the ALS by way of media and library material, librarians, research assistance, study material, etc and where these are located as well as the times accessible.<br><br>▪ Accommodation<br>Provide layouts of the facilities available to the ALS and how these are allocated with floor areas indicated. | |
| 15 | J. Practice, training and professional development<br><br>▪ Describe the Practical Training arrangements (if any). What involvement has the ALS with the profession locally? Is there provision for mid-career education courses by the ALS?<br><br>▪ What part does the ALS play in regional Continuing Professional Development (CPD) activities and what is the parent institution's policy in this connection? | |
| **16** | **PART 3 – APPENDICES** | |
| 17 | Appendix A – Programme Structure and the HEQF | |
| 18 | Appendix B – Report by student body | |
| 19 | Appendix C – Core syllabi | Provide core syllabi for all subjects including credits, details of the number of hours for each subject, as well as reading lists. No more than half a page should be allocated to each subject. |
| 20 | Appendix D – Design projects | Each with a short paragraph describing the aim, nature and scope, as well as assessment criteria. |
| 21 | Appendix E – External Examiners | For all years of study for all subjects, for the current year and past three years. Note which of the external Examiners the board will meet. |

| | PART 3 – APPENDICES | |
|---|---|---|
| 22 | Appendix F – Status of Prof. Master's Programme | |
| 23 | Appendix G – Research Outputs | |
| **24** | **PART 4 – PREVIOUS VALIDATION REPORT** | |

# Appendix H – Validation report template

**COVER PAGE**
REPORT OF THE VISITING SACAP BOARD TO
THE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURE AT THE [Name of university]
[Date of validation]
[Status: e.g. draft, final]

**CONTENTS**
Table of contents
List of acronyms
Acknowledgements
Executive summary
Preamble
Validation process, aim and objectives
Criteria for validation
Members of the visiting board

| Name | Qualification/ Affiliations | Representation | E-mail |
|------|------------------------------|----------------|--------|
|      |                              |                |        |
|      |                              |                |        |

Recommendations to SACAP and the CAA [The following statement is from the CAA template]

The visiting board recommends to SACAP Council [Initial or Continued] Unconditional Validation of:
[Title of course(s), e.g. M Arch (Prof.)]
**or**
[Initial/Continued] Conditional Validation of: [Title of course(s), e.g. M Arch (Prof.)]

Statement of reasons for conditional validation
- Actions required to rectify omissions within course content and/or areas where standards need to be improved;
- Evidence required to demonstrate that the conditions have been met;
- Timescale for fulfilling conditions

**or**
Withdrawal of validation of: [Title of course(s), e.g. M Arch (Prof.)]
Statement of reasons for withdrawal of validation

The next visiting board will be held in [year]

Observations and feedback
- Branding and intellectual identity

Commentary
- Documentation, digital presentation and exhibition of work;
- Self Appraisal and response to previous Visiting Board Report;
- Comments based on interviews with management;
- Comments based on interviews with external examiners;
- Comments based on interviews with students;
- Comments based on interviews with staff

Resourcing and facilities
- Studios;
- Library;
- Crit spaces;
- Recreation (e.g. refreshment kiosks);
- Parking;
- Security and access;
- Staff offices;
- Lecture rooms;
- Auditoria;
- Storage;
- Private meeting spaces;
- Quality and comfort.

Review of courses [Review each according to the headings in Appendix E of the Purple Book]
- Design;
- History and theory;
- Construction and technology;
- Architectural and business practice;
- Etcetera

General [Special attributes of the ALS]

Advice [List with subheadings]

Conclusion

Appendices
- Appendix A – Summary of validation criteria applied;
- Appendix B – Timetable;
- Appendix C – Programme structure;
- Appendix D – Head of Department's assessment of validation visit;
- Etcetera.