



SOUTH AFRICAN COUNCIL
for the
ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION

CONFIDENTIAL

STATEMENT OF THE VALIDATION BOARD

PRESENTED TO

**THE DEPARTMENT OF ARCHITECTURAL TECHNOLOGY AND INTERIOR DESIGN
AT THE CAPE PENINSULA UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY**

Revisit conducted on behalf of and in association with

**THE SOUTH AFRICAN COUNCIL FOR THE ARCHITECTURAL PROFESSION (SACAP)
THE COMMONWEALTH ASSOCIATION OF ARCHITECTS (CAA)
THE COUNCIL FOR THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT (CBE)
THE COUNCIL ON HIGHER EDUCATION (CHE)**

for

National Diploma: Architectural Technology
Bachelor of Technology: Architectural Technology

15—16 August 2016

Contents

List of Acronyms 3

Members of the Validation Board 4

Acknowledgements 5

1. Recommendations to SACAP and the CAA 6

2. Pre-Visit Meeting..... 7

3. Validation Board Findings 7

4. Conclusion 10

Declaration and Signatures 11

List of Acronyms

ALS	Architectural Learning Site'
CAA	Commonwealth Association of Architects
CBE	Council for the Built Environment
CHE	Council on Higher Education
CPUT	Cape Peninsula University of Technology
HoD	Head of Department
SACAP	South African Council for the Architectural Profession
QIP	Quality Improvement Plan
TUT	Tshwane University of Technology
Unisa	University of South Africa
VB	Validation Board
WIL	Workplace Integrated Learning

Members of the Validation Board

Name	Qualifications/affiliations	Representation	e-mail
Ms Cecilia Chinga (Chairperson)	BArch(CBU) PrArch/TUT	SACAP	cecietam@gmail.com
Prof. Roger Fisher (Secretary)	PhD(Arch) (Pretoria) PrArch	SACAP Academic: University of Pretoria	rogercfisher@gmail.com
Mr Rakau Lekota (Member)	MTech(Applied Design)(TUT)	SACAP Architect: Department of Public Works	rakauw@yahoo.com
Ms Sithabile Mathe	PG Diploma in Architecture (Glasgow) Urbanism Studies (Oslo)	CAA Practicing Architect	smathe@moralodesigns.com
Prof. Dr Abu Sayeed M Ahmed	Dipl.-Ing. (M. Arch), Dr.-Ing. (PhD)	CAA Academic: University of Asia Pacific	mail@iab.com.bd sayeed@uap-bd.edu
Ms Marella O'Reilly (Observer)	MBL(Unisa)	SACAP	Marella.O'reilly@sacapsa.com
Mr Leon White (Observer)	BTech(TUT)	CBE	leon@cbe.org.za

Acknowledgements

The Validation Board wishes to thank the following people for their time, effort, arrangements and hospitality:

- Prof. A Staak – Deputy Vice-Chancellor (CPUT)
- Prof. J Cronje – Dean of the Faculty of Informatics and Design (CPUT)
- Ms L Airey – Director of the Quality Management Directorate (CPUT)
- Ms M Di Ruvo – Acting Head of Department (CPUT)
- Academic and administrative staff
- Students
- SACAP administrative staff

1. Recommendations to SACAP and the CAA

SACAP has an obligation in terms of Clause 13 of the Architectural Profession Act 44 of 2000, to:

- (a) "conduct accreditation visits to any education institution which has a department, school or faculty of architecture" and;
- (b) "either conditionally or unconditionally grant, refuse or withdraw accreditation to all educational institutions and their educational programmes with regard to architecture".

The Validation Board finds that there is evidence that the ALS had made sufficient progress in addressing the conditions set by the September 2015 .

The Board recommends to SACAP

- continued validation of

National Diploma: Architectural Technology

For purposes of registration of graduates as Candidate Architectural Technologist

Bachelor of Technology: Architectural Technology

For purposes of registration of graduates as Candidate Senior Architectural Technologist

- that SACAP informs the CHE and CBE that the accreditation of the architectural programmes at this institution are continued.

The Board recommends to the CAA that

Bachelor of Technology: Architectural Technology

fulfils the academic requirements of CAA Part 1, and is recommended for continued study in a CAA Part 2 programme.

2. Pre-Visit Meeting

The members of the Board met in the Dining Hall of the Protea Fire and Ice Hotel in Cape Town where they lodged for a working supper at 19:00 on 14th August 2016 to review the **proposed programme** (Annexure 1) **and report of the ALS** (Annexure 2) and confirm roles of the members and procedures for the visit.

The Board agreed that the purpose of the visit is to confirm whether the conditions set by the full Validation Board(VB) of September 2015 had been adequately addressed, and that the Board would not consider any new issues.

3. Validation Board Findings

In order to ascertain whether the department has addressed the conditions, the VB inspected evidence provided by the department, including the Quality Implementation Plan (QIP) report, portfolios of students' work, assignments and examination scripts, and interacted with staff and students as per the validation visit programme (Annexure 1)

The conditions are set out here, together with the ALS's responses and the findings of the VB:

3.1. "The institution submits a detailed QIP to SACAP by 29 January 2016."

VB findings

The institution submitted a detailed QIP within the stipulated timeframe and ratified by SACAP (Annexure 3). The Visiting Board received a document indicating progress that had been made to the plan.

3.2. The department must prioritise the appointment of a substantive Head of Department, in a non-acting capacity.

ALS response

In keeping with CPUT policy this is a rotating 5 year contract post and therefore has been advertised internally. Prior to this post being advertised, all existing vacant posts within the department should be filled and in so doing try to attract suitable candidates to the department. Evidence regarding the appointments made will be available to the panel on site.

VB findings

The two posts for lecturers were advertised, and filled. In the interim, Ms Monica di Ruvo has been appointed as acting HoD. Interviews for the position of Head of Department were conducted in the same period as the visit, and it is anticipated that one of the candidates would be appointed as a substantive HoD before the end of the year.

Although the appointment of a substantive HoD was not complete, the VB was presented with concrete evidence of this process being completed shortly after the visit to the school. The university also assured the Visiting Board that SACAP would be informed as soon as the appointment had been finalised.

- 1) The introduction of effective Quality Control Systems that will address :
 - a) A vertical coordination system for the various subject streams

ALS response

Appointment of subject stream co-ordinators amongst the lecturing staff, although staff have been co-ordinating their subject within the year, there has not been anyone co-ordinating the subject stream vertically through the programme.

A curriculum map of the new curriculum is being used to show the vertical articulation as each of the new subject streams is developed. This will be part of the presentation to the Board.

VB findings:

The suggested changes to the programme are positive. There is a clear vertical articulation of the core subjects between the years of study. The communication of the programme integration efforts taken to date is commendable. Articulating its intentions clearly, and in a very legible and graphic way also enables these aims to be accessible to students, and can only enhance their own learning. Efforts to further this ambition through better inclusion of the student body by developing an architectural language glossary, enabling part-time learning, use of online platforms are commended.

- b) Revision of programme content and outcomes to meet the minimum SACAP and CAA competences.

The review material indicates a clearer, more structured sense of the programme identity. The display of studio work and related subject files was an informative reflection of the subject integration and its related outcomes in teaching. The integration of design and technology across the years is now evident.

- c) Provision of infrastructure, resources and facilities that are conducive to the delivery of the programmes.

ALS response

The move to Media City took place in December 2014. It is expected that we will be occupying these offices till the end of 2017. Although there are shortcomings, the conditions are greatly improved from the previous premises. In order to address shortcomings, a task team has been set up including members of staff, Alex Noble, Niven Naidoo and assisted by the student charter (CAIF). Suggestions are being tabled at Departmental meetings and a scope of work is being drawn up accordingly for implementation. As we will be relocating to more suitable premises on Campus every effort will be made to invest in items that can be moved and reused in the new premises.

VB findings

The found a great improvement to the physical facilities during their visit. Even when spaces are not ideal, they have a better school-of-architecture feel. Signage has been upgraded, lending a sense of identity. The VB wishes to commend the ALS on positively addressing this concern. The overall physical environment of the school has greatly improved. The students have positively inhabited their space throughout. Studio design projects, where students had to make their own furniture, yielded positive results and created an opportunity for integration across the years, as well as between disciplines.

There is a marked difference in the environment and a clear physical presence of the ALS is experienced from the reception on the ground floor, and throughout the building. This is achieved by the use of clear signage and display of students work along the passages and the walls. The sterile and bland atmosphere experienced in the last visit has been replaced with a vibrant one. Even though the building in its nature does not present much opportunity to be well-fitted for a department of architecture, the board commends the Department's effort.

d) Transparency and proper management of assessment system

ALS response

Staff to be offered refresher training in assessment and moderation.

Existing systems to be better utilised, support strategies to be put in place.

Design of rubrics to be standardised, ensuring adequate levels of feedback to students across the Department. Existing systems to be better utilised, support strategies to be put in place.

VB findings

There is a clearer sense of purpose and management, as evidenced by well-organised files and supporting documentation.

The Board was presented with evidence of the improvement of project and assignment briefs and assessment rubrics across all subjects. The VB is of the opinion that this will greatly improve the transparent manner in which feedback is given to students.

4. Conclusion

The VB appreciates of the spirit of engagement, hospitality and collegiality of the staff and students of the Department of Architecture and Interior Design. A special vote of gratitude must be extended to the sterling efforts of Ms Monica Di Ruvo in achieving a credible response to the conditions set in the previous report of the full SACAP/ CAA Validation Board, in such a short period as acting HoD. The VB applauds the difference that the appointment of Ms Di Ruvo seems to have made since her appointment in the acting HoD position. Substantial effort is evident from the complete turnaround of the state affairs at the ALS within 12 months of the last visit.

It is commendable that the school is developing strategies to train their own graduates, especially in trying to meet the needs for more diversity amongst the staff at the school.

Throughout the duration of the visit, it was very evident that the acting HoD efforts to resolve long-standing staff conflicts had been thorough and sincere in trying to reach a positive outcome for all involved. Overall cohesion amongst the majority of the staff is evident and the conflict has been isolated to a small minority. That said, the school must now make concerted efforts to conclude the outcomes from the process as not doing so will continue to allow animosity to develop, and seriously undermine the further delivery of the programme.

The staff expressed that the Advisory Board for the school is still not accountable and has very poor attendance. In developing the programme, the school will need to make this liaison more robust in order to ensure that the link with industry is more cohesive and supportive.

The student body must also be part of an on-going consultation process in developing the new curriculum.

The VB believes that the ALS's commitment to updating and improving the document management and quality management policies and procedure (as witnessed during the visit) will further enhance the outcomes of the ALS. The move to enhance the assessment method by using alternative techniques, such as BlackBoard, will enhance the delivery of the programmes.

At this stage, the VB cannot comment on the major curriculum changes proposed by the ALS until due processes are concluded. It is recommended that the ALS engage SACAP on an advisory basis in anticipation of the validation of the new curriculum.

Declaration and Signatures

This report has been compiled by Prof. Roger Fisher (VB Secretary), with contributions from all the Board members. All opinions, recommendations and advice were arrived at on consensus of all Board members, under the direction of the Board chairperson.

The signed report is hereby tabled to the SACAP Education Committee. The Validation Board recommends that the committee accept the contents and findings of this report, and further recommend it to the Council for ratification and adoption as the final validation report of the architectural programmes at CPUT.

FOR THE VALIDATION BOARD

Signed at **Pretoria** of this 18th day of **November 2016**



Ms Cecilia E Chinga
Chairperson

FOR CPUT

Signed at **Cape Town** this 29th day of **September 2016**



Ms Monica Di Ruvo

Acting Head of Department (CPUT)
Department of Architecture and Interior Design
(Acceptance of the report with regards to matters of fact)

FOR SACAP

Signed at **Pretoria** of this 16 day of **November 2016**



Mr R Lekota
Chairperson – SACAP Education Committee



QUALITY MANAGEMENT DIRECTORATE

**SACAP Validation visit: 14 -16 August, 2016
Draft Programme**

TIME	ACTIVITY	PERSON/S INVOLVED
14th August 2016 (Sunday)		
18:00	Pre-meeting of the Visiting Board. Chairperson to preside assisted by Visiting Board Secretary or Coordinator	Board
15th August, 2016 (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, Staff
08:30 - 09:00	Courtesy meeting with CPUT officials	Board, CPUT
09:00 – 11:00	<p>Presentation by HOD of the outline of the QIP and progress.</p> <p>Detailed presentation on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilities and infrastructure • Vertical coordination in the programme. • Programme alignment to SACAP competencies. • Assessment. 	HoD, Board, Lecturers
11:00 – 11:20	Tea break	HoD, Board
11:20 – 11:45	Private meeting with head of ALS (to include brief orientation tour of premises where necessary)	HoD, Board
11:45 – 12:30	Meeting with external examiners	Board, examiners
12:30 - 13:00	Lunch with Dean, Head and staff who teach in Architectural Programme	Dean, Staff , Board

13:00 - 13:45	Meeting with students and alumni	Board, Students, Alumni
13:45 – 14:30	Meeting with PT and FT staff without the ALS head	Board, Staff
14:30 – 17:30	Members of the Visiting Board divide their time between inspection of portfolios and other exhibited work. Exhibition of best work.	Board
17:30	Board departs to Guest House	Board
16th August, 2016 (Tuesday)		
07:30	Board to be collected at Guest House	
08:00 – 11:00	Private meeting of Visiting Board to agree on general findings and report content. Call for additional evidence. Draft statement.	Board
11:00-11:30	Tea	
11:30 – 12:30	Meeting with DVC, Dean and Director: QMD to convey essential findings and hand over statement.	Board, DVC, Dean, Director: QMD,
12:30 – 13:15	Private meeting with Head of ALS to convey essential findings.	Board, HoD,
13:15- 14:00	Lunch	Board, DVC, Dean, Director: QMD, staff
14:00 –	Depending on Visiting Board Members' completion of the Report and travelling arrangements Submit draft report to Head of ALS for factual checking	Board

