

SCOSA Education Group Online Forum re: ARB changes – 16th May, 2-4pm

1. Manolo Guerci (SAA Director of Graduate Studies, Kent) – organiser
mg316@kent.ac.uk

Dlara Naqi (PhD candidate, Kent) – assistant
d.naqi@kent.ac.uk

Final Participants lists, all divided into breakout groups of about 8, each with a facilitator (see below)

1. Alberto Villanueva	(Arch. Programme Director, Ravensbourne)
2. Alex Warnock-Smith	(Prog. Dir., Spatial Practices, Central St Martin's)
3. Alexander Dusterloh	(BA Arch Director of Studies, Liverpool)
4. Carl Callaghan	(Head of Department, UEL)
5. Carl Meddings	(MArch Lead, Centre for Alternative Technology)
6. Chloe Street Tarbatt	(SAA Head of School, Kent)
7. Chris Jones	(Design Tutor, Kent; former Head, Leicester)
8. Christian Groothuizen	(UEL)
9. Claire Ridout	(Part 3 Lead, Portsmouth)
10. Denver Hendricks	(Acting Head of School, Lincoln)
11. Das Fagan	(Head of Architecture, Lancaster)
12. Eva Sopeoglu	(London South Bank)
13. Heba Elsharkawy	(Head of School, Kingston)
14. Helen O'Connor	(MArch Course Lead, Dundee)
15. Ian Parkes	(BA Architecture Course Lead, Bath Spa) (Didn't stay for breakout room)
16. Igea Troiani	(Head of School, London South Bank)
17. Jane Mcallister	(BA Course Lead, London Met)
18. Jenny Russell	(Director of Education and Learning, RIBA)
19. Justin Lunn	(Leeds)
20. Lucelia Rodrigues	(Head of Department, Nottingham)
21. Luke Murray	(on teams)
22. Manolo Guerci	(SAA Director of Graduate Studies, Kent)
23. Martina Murphy	(Ulster)
24. Michael Grant	(Strathclyde)
25. Nick Webb	(Liverpool)
26. Paolo Zaide	(BA Architecture Course Lead, Westminster)
27. Paul Ring	(Head of Subject for Architecture, Northumbria)
28. Penelope Plaza	(Joint Head of School, Reading)
29. Peter Baldwin	(Loughborough)
30. Peter Wislocki	(SAA Architecture Director of Studies, Kent)
31. Richard Difford	(Arch Master courses coordinator, Westminster)
32. Rosi Fieldson	(Lincoln)
33. Samuel Austin	(Director of Architecture, Newcastle)
34. Sandra Denicke-Polcher	(Education Associate Dean, RCA), (Didn't stay for breakout room)
35. Simon Chadwick	(Architecture Programmes Lead, Sheffield)
36. Stefania Boccaletti	(BSc Arch & Environ Des Course Lead, Westminster)
37. Susanne Bauer	(Part 3, Westminster)

38. Tanya Griffiths	(BA Course Lead, Falmouth)
39. Ulrike Enslein	(Final Year Lead, Strathclyde)
40. Victoria Jolley	(Deputy Head, Manchester)
41. Victoria Dean Lourenco	(SAA Director of Recruitment & Admissions, Kent)

BREAK OUT GROUPS

Group 1

2.	Manolo Guerci	(SAA Director of Graduate Studies, Kent)
3.	Alexander Dusterloh	(BA Arch Director of Studies, Liverpool)
4.	Beth	(RCA)
5.	Igea Troiani	(Head of School, London South Bank)
6.	Martina Murphy	(on teams)
7.	Paolo Zaide	(BA Architecture Course Lead, Westminster)
8.	Ulrike Enslein	(Final Year Lead, Strathclyde)

Group 2

1.	Simon Chadwick	(Architecture Programmes Lead, Sheffield)
2.	Justin Lunn	(Leeds)
3.	Lucelia Rodrigues	(Head of Department, Nottingham)
4.	Nick Webb	(Liverpool)
5.	Peter Baldwin	(Loughborough)
6.	Samuel Austin	(Director of Architecture, Newcastle)

Group 3

1.	Paul Ring	(Head of Subject for Architecture, Northumbria)
2.	Chris Jones	(Design Tutor, Kent; former Head, Leicester)
3.	Das Fagan	(Acting Head of School, Lincoln)
4.	Denver Hendricks	(Head of Architecture, Lancaster)
5.	Helen O'Connor	(MArch Course Lead, Dundee)
6.	Michael Grant	(Strathclyde)
7.	Susanne Bauer	(Part 3, Westminster)

Group 4

1.	Chloe Street Tarbatt	(SAA Head of School, Kent)
2.	Christian Groothuizen	(UEL)
3.	Heba Elsharkawy	(Head of School, Kingston)
4.	Jane Mcallister	(BA Course Lead, London Met)
5.	Jenny Russell	(Director of Education and Learning, RIBA)
6.	Penelope Plaza	(Joint Head of School, Reading)

Group 5

1.	Tanya Griffiths	(BA Course Lead, Falmouth)
2.	Alberto Villanueva	(Arch. Programme Director, Ravensbourne)
3.	Rosi Fieldson	(on teams)
4.	Stefania Boccaletti	(BSc Arch & Environ Des Course Lead, Westminster)

Group 6

1.	Victoria Dean Lourenco	(SAA Director of Recruitment & Admissions, Kent)
2.	Alex Warnock-Smith	(Prog. Dir., Spatial Practices, Central St Martin's)
3.	Carl Callaghan	(Head of Department, UEL)
4.	Carl Meddings	(MArch Lead, Centre for Alternative Technology)
5.	Claire Ridout	(Part 3 Lead, Portsmouth)
6.	Eva Sopeoglu	(London South Bank)
7.	Luke Murray	(on teams)
8.	Peter Wislocki	(SAA Architecture Director of Studies, Kent)
9.	Richard Difford	(Arch Master courses coordinator, Westminster)

PROGRAMME

1. *ARB proposed changes - how are you responding? Discussion/sharing respective approaches re: different context/outcomes. Learning from one another as a base to share good practice*
2. *SCOSA Education Working Group: where next?*

All **(15 mins)**

M. Guerci (Kent)

Brief introduction setting framework and scope of meeting (3 mins)

D. Naqi (Kent) (2 mins)

Info re: break out session

Wendy Colvin (APSA - Association of Professional Studies in Architecture)

PPE Forum Summary (10 mins)

Break-out sessions: **(1Hour)**

6 groups each with a facilitator, discussing the main topics and their sub-questions (see tables below)

All **(45 mins)**

- Facilitators' report on group discussions and general discussion
- Recommendation for point 2

Discussion Topics

1) ARB PROPOSED CHANGES

A. Emerging Model/s: Which and Why

An integrated Part2/3 model seems to be the model that ARB are trying to encourage, and one that is echoed in the PPE commission report.

Groups	Is anyone considering this at their institution?	What other models are being explored?	How are providers considering handling assessment of applicant's 'competency' at entry?	How might applicants from other disciplines be supported into Part 2/3 entry?	Where does this leave delivery and content for our Part 1 courses?
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Never used to think about different models prior to the proposed changes. No apprenticeship, no Integrated Part 2/3. Waiting to see the cards first. To understand how things can work, need to know a bit more. Working it out now.• Integrated master is a good way forward to develop Part 2 and Part 3. No Part 3 at the moment.• Already have Level 7 apprenticeship in place, and if funding goes ahead, it's already integrated. More involvement of practitioners. This is not a new model.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Part 1 and Part 2; Part 3 managed by [redacted]. No Part 3. Larger questions remain. No plan yet. Requires a major rewrite and restructuring. Working it out now. Details aren't set in stone.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Started mapping their Part 2 course against the competency framework, but it's not yet in the system. They've integrated Parts 1 and 2 after four years in collaboration with [redacted] to allow students to enter the competency phase.• Reviewed the competencies at an early stage some time ago, so this shouldn't be entirely new. They need time and space to complete this.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nothing Written	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A collaborative new PPE Course, which made the BA program one of the largest. Combining Part 1 and Part 2 seems to be the most practical.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• All contributors are currently working on some form of integrated Masters (Part 2) qualification.• Some contributors suggested a four-year academic Part 2 course, with an exit after three years to award RIBA Part 1 and no integrated PPE, while allowing students to pause their studies as needed to maintain maximum flexibility.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• PPE integration varies across programs. Some courses already include practical placements, administer them through a dedicated module, and assess a portfolio at the end of the placement.• When merging a traditional undergraduate program with an MArch, clearly defining entry and exit points is crucial. Some institutions are considering offering an unaccredited exit award, so only the final two years' learning outcomes are mapped to accreditation standards, while the first two or three years remain unmapped.	Nothing Written	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some are exploring a 'Primer Year' or six-month foundation course to upskill non-cognate graduates before an integrated MArch. However, funding remains problematic: Student Finance England only offers full UG funding for MArch to architecture (not architectural technology) graduates.	Nothing Written
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Doesn't fit in Scotland.• No guidance being offered at present for	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A lack of a clear standard model could lead to inconsistent options that aren't effective for institutions or applicants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Applicant will include a mapping exercise within the folio.• Validated Part 1.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• How do we compress absent competency into a pre-programme study experience in	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Introduce more creative flair in Part 1• Foster a sense of liberation

	<p>the Part 3 offer in Scotland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of Scottish students are going to Newcastle for Part 3. • Not all schools offer Part 3 and access other regions. • A challenge to integrate locally. • Link with practices for Part 3 isn't as coherent as is required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is too vague at the minute. • Emphasise stronger Part 2 links with professional practice rather than a fully integrated Part 2/3 offer. • Securing and funding mentorship placements within practice remains a challenge. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the expected competencies should be expressed within a portfolio from non-cognate applicants. 	<p>preparation for the accredited programme?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional support in studio is required (based upon broad design-based MA delivery experiences). • Acknowledge concerns about impracticality and potential legal exposure. • Broader definition of what cognate UG study is? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enable greater variability through a thematic study • Adopt a less prescriptive approach • Emphasise these elements as vital
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Combined Part 2 and Part 3 (MArch and PP) – 4-year master – MArch plus two years in practice with a PSA as a Professional Practice Diploma... Keeping standalone 2-year Part 2 as an option... Can sign up to 4 year with exit award at MArch. Part 1 remains standalone for the moment. Likely to do combined 1 and 2 in longer term. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five-year integrated Part 1/Part 2 program: Part 1 is compressed into two September–September academic years (three terms) with an optional credited placement year. If a placement isn't secured, students move straight into the two-year Part 2, enabling completion in four years. Placement opportunities depend on industry partnerships and practitioner engagement. • Restructuring the academic calendar from terms to semesters, with revised credit weightings and validation of Parts 1 and 2 this summer (Part 2 content remains unchanged), followed by a review period. Part 1 students can work as teaching or research assistants, but the optional industry year introduces risk to the integrated model. To address this, module descriptors are being rewritten to align with institutional standards and the Credit Framework. • RIBA Studio – widening access programme – examination programme – contracted to Oxford Brookes – set briefs and mark work. • Work in practice while doing the course – no travel • Part 3 programme – picks up universities without a P3 – can be undertaken from practice abroad but examination held in the UK and recognised by ARB. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Major question about assessing competency for students from different disciplines: is it feasible to fast-track Years 1 and 2 into Part 2? How should the criteria be demonstrate, portfolio, test, or interview? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offer a graduate diploma in related creative fields (e.g., design and fashion), with shared modules to bridge into the two-year Part 2 midway through the integrated pathway. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part 1 remains standalone for the moment. • Loss of leverage for Part 1 is problematic; flexibility can pose a threat to quality, comparable to what happened when fee scales were dissolved.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early stages of development – currently no Part II or III but looking at integrated 4- or 5- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part I, II and III (largest Part III course in the UK); some diversification (new BSc and Masters in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of integrated foundation years (IFYs) or preparatory 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supplementary IFYs for cognate subjects, providing modules in design theory and related 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Widening access in this way could lessen the undergraduate degree's perceived value and

	<p>year models; not looking at Part II and III combined.</p> <p>Operating the 'classic' model; not currently exploring new models or Apprenticeships or Part III.</p>	<p>environmental science) but no integrated model.</p>	<p>modules (e.g. Design Theory) to build and assess competency for entry to Part II equivalents.</p>	<p>skills to bridge into Part II entry for non-architecture backgrounds</p>	<p>might lead employers to train their own candidates, potentially reshaping the profession</p>
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Still in discussions • Transition applications in process • Still mapping and exploring transitions • Still considering options • Been awaiting PPE Commission (April 2025) • Access course being considered (including professional practice) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of potential models on ARB website – does it indicate what institutions are applying for? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential issues for practices to stay aligned amidst differing institutional approaches – need for consistency. • Potential lack of time in practice may hinder students' ability. • Still a selection process at university discretion. • Institutions are familiar with varied entry-level students. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitional year is difficult but essential • Funding cuts remain a concern (TBC) • Weekly FD published but not on government website. • Part-time study is being explored 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part 1 risks drifting without RIBA oversight • TEF Gold: problematic if 5-year degree becomes incomplete. • Exit options needed – TEF incompleteness data could present issues. • Consistency is necessary for all learning providers to ensure effective recruitment and admissions at every stage, including international recruitment and partnership development

Summary of the responses:

Q1. Is anyone considering this at their institution?

- Active planning or early-stage development towards integrated Part 2/3 at:
 - Institution A mapping curricula now (Group 1)
 - All contributors working on some form of integration (Group 2)
 - Institution B piloting a combined Part 2 + 3 route (Group 4)
 - Institution C in the very early scoping phase (Group 5)
 - General “still in discussions” status and transitional applications underway (Group 6)
- Some schools report no current guidance and that integrated Part 2/3 is untested in certain regions (Group 3)

Q2. What other models are being explored?

- Four-year master’s program with an interim exit after three years (Part 1 qualification) and built-in ‘pause’ points (Groups 1, 2)
- Apprenticeship pathways that blend workplace learning with academic credit (Groups 1, 2)
- Accelerated undergraduate routes (e.g., two-year Part 1 track to fast-track into the master’s) (Group 2)
- Preparatory foundation years to develop any missing competencies (Groups 3, 5)
- Graduate diploma pathways for related fields, sharing select Part 1 modules (Group 4)

Q3. How are providers considering handling assessment of applicant’s ‘competency’ at entry?

- Portfolio review plus interview or test to verify design and technical skills (Groups 1, 5)
- Embedded practice modules with workplace portfolios assessed post-placement (Group 1)
- Supplementary foundation modules ensuring core outcomes before Part 2 (Groups 3, 5)
- Formal mapping of curricula against the professional competency framework (Group 1)

Q4. How might applicants from other disciplines be supported into Part 2/3 entry?

- Foundational year programs offering core design and technical modules (Groups 3, 5)
- Graduate diploma routes for related fields (e.g., graphic design, fashion) leading into Part 2 (Group 4)
- Mentored studio support with customised pre-programme study (Group 4)
- Short up-skilling courses (six-month options) subject to student finance approval (Groups 2, 6)

Q5. Where does this leave delivery and content for our Part 1 courses?

- Retain the standalone Part 1, at least temporarily, to safeguard accreditation and performance metrics (Groups 4, 5)
- Compress or merge Parts 1 & 2, adjusting credit weightings accordingly (Groups 1, 2)
- Shift from term-based to semester-based structure and revise credit loads to support integrated pathways (Group 2)
- Concerns that excessive flexibility could undermine Part 1’s quality and value (Groups 5, 6)

B. Professional Practice Experience/ ROC (Record of Competency)

G r o u p s	How might industry-required skills and competencies be better integrated/supported in new models and/or curriculums?	Given the likelihood that ARB might put the RoC design out to open tender to be delivered by a consultancy, what is our view on the design brief (considering graduates and employers needs as well as those of learning providers)?	What are the possible route/s forward for ARB to fully engage with schools on the PPE and ROC (see draft plan for ARB consultation prepared by Simon Chadwick below)
	1 Nothing Written	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is currently no representation in this process, and no consultation appears to have taken place. What mechanisms are in place for stakeholder input? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Students are not only interested in industry and professionalism – asymmetry of what we are experiencing because of two bodies. Over-reach. Broader questions as to the sustainability of arch education in this country. Issues with money requested from bodies, which uni can't budget..
	2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PPE was integrated in a variety of ways. Some courses offer practical experience within the course already and administer and monitor this. For example, one institution treats the placement as a course module and evaluates the portfolio upon completion. 	Nothing Written	Nothing Written
	3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Link with practices for Part 3 isn't as coherent as is required 	Nothing Written	Nothing Written
	4 Nothing Written	Nothing Written	Nothing Written
	5 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commission survey data via SCOSA to build an evidence base on student and employer needs, informing integration of industry competencies. 	Nothing Written	Nothing Written
	6 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PEDRs could be 'flipped' – with trainees responsible for proving competencies. PEDRs should be prepared in real time. Reflective statements required. Simpler logbooks needed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One central, shared repository or form. Outsourcing Part 3 (like in the U.S.) seen as problematic. A final interview with independent assessment could work. Needs clarification and clear representation from architects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relax the timeframe as per PPE recommendation- the current timeline is unrealistic. Overcomplicated timeframe. SCOSA could develop a simpler framework? ARB must clarify reasoning and provide evidence of intended outcomes for changes. Concern ARB changes may have opposite effect of what's intended.

Summary of the responses:

Q1. How might industry-required skills and competencies be better integrated/supported in new models and/or curriculums?

- **Group 1:** Called for regulatory bodies to limit their scope, emphasising that education should also focus on sustainability and financial viability, and noting a lack of stakeholder consultation.
- **Group 2:** Pointed out that some programs already integrate practical experience, such as a dedicated placement module with an assessed portfolio.
- **Group 3:** Observed that connections between schools and the final professional phase are fragmented, with unclear responsibility for integration.
- **Group 5:** Suggested commissioning survey data to establish evidence on student and employer needs, to inform how competencies should be integrated.
- **Group 6:** Proposed several measures to streamline competency tracking, including self-verification by trainees, real-time record-keeping with reflective statements, simplified logbooks in a shared repository, piloting an independent final review, loosening rigid timelines, and calling for clearer guidance on intended outcomes to prevent unintended consequences.

Q2. Given the likelihood that ARB might put the RoC design out to open tender to be delivered by a consultancy, what is our view on the design brief (considering graduates and employers needs as well as those of learning providers)?

Group 6: Warned that outsourcing the final phase could undermine standards; recommended retaining an independent final review; advocated for clear practitioner involvement in program development; and called for objectives grounded in evidence and a streamlined framework.

Q3. What are the possible route/s forward for ARB to fully engage with schools on the PPE and ROC (see draft plan for ARB consultation prepared by Simon Chadwick below)

- **Group 6:** Called for consistent, transparent communication channels between ARB and schools; a single repository for competency records; flexibility in delivery timelines (e.g., relaxed deadlines); involvement of SCOSA to simplify frameworks and gather stakeholder feedback; and recognition of varied institutional approaches to ensure equity in admissions and professional readiness

C. Challenges and Opportunities

G r o u p s	Differences in approach required for different types of learning provider	Feasibility of time scales for rolling out changes given internal review processes required	Resourcing implications especially around specialist expertise and knowledge requirements	Implications of reduced leverage within HE institutions for these high-cost courses?	Should we consider a re-run of the survey which Jenny Russell supported to obtain a follow up view now that the PPE report is published? This could capture some movement and crystallisation of approaches.
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Significant variation exists across programs, making a single unified goal impractical.• A staged model that accommodates distinct pathways aligned to different ambitions is recommended.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• More time.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consultation: meeting in a collaborative way with ARB, RIBA, and the government to develop joint solutions. Highlight the gap between higher education institutions and government, emphasising the need for focused dialogue and inclusive representation	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Student fees and loans: not resolved	Nothing Written
2	Nothing Written	Nothing Written	Nothing Written	Nothing Written	Nothing Written
3	Nothing Written	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Too little clarity from ARB to allow schools to move forward with confidence	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Huge practice involvement will be critical, yes, HEIs are being forced to reduce part-time teaching budgets.	Nothing Written	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rural vs urban context and implications... Universities with very different profiles?	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• PPE relaxing time-frame – calendar needs to be realistic. Relaxing deadline would allow proper research to be undertaken by SCOSA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Time and Resource: Additional demands as coordinator of the competency log; HESA banding categorisation for Architecture is critical to support professional requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Loss of leverage for Part 1 is problematic; flexibility threatens quality.	Nothing Written
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Need to account for rural vs urban contexts, rural providers face unique access challenges (limited local practice availability, financial barriers).	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pressure on timelines and risks generally for institutions, flexibility without clarity is an impediment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Concerns about drops in recruitment, funding and fees, loss of international students, and ‘validation fatigue’ stressing scarce resources	Nothing Written	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Yes, commission follow-up survey data via SCOSA to capture shifts in approaches and build an evidence base.
6	Nothing Written	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• We are at risk of running out of time , current deadlines may need to be revised.• Too many variables remain unresolved, making informed planning and implementation difficult.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mentoring experiences can be inconsistent, often described as a ‘light touch’ in practice, which raises questions about the depth and quality of professional development students are receiving.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Institutions may struggle to recruit or retain professionals with both academic and industry experience, especially within current budget constraints.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The PPE framework lacks clarity; the ARB must define its position to guide institutions.• While there’s widespread frustration, there’s also a strong desire for practical solutions.• SCOSA should unite providers behind a coordinated response.• The ARB should register practices as well as

					<p>individuals for consistent professional oversight.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-running Ms. Russell's (RIBA) survey would benchmark progress and reveal areas of alignment. • Broad support exists for change, but it needs clear guidelines and sector-wide consistency.
--	--	--	--	--	---

Summary of the responses:

Q1. Differences in approach required for different types of learning providers

- One-size-fits-all is untenable: institutions vary too widely in ambition and context, so curricula must adopt stage-based pathways tailored to each institution's goals (Group 1)
- Rural vs urban contexts demand different solutions: rural schools face limited local practice placements and greater financial barriers compared to urban counterparts (Groups 4, 5)

Q2. Feasibility of time scales for rolling out changes given internal review processes required

- Current deadlines are unrealistic and need extending to allow proper consultation and research (Groups 1, 4, 6)
- Lack of clear guidance from ARB undermines confidence and stalls progress; firm timelines can't be set until key details are resolved (Groups 3, 5, 6)

Q3. Resourcing implications, especially around specialist expertise and knowledge requirements

- Collaborative consultation is needed: regulatory board (ARB), professional body (RIBA), government, and institutions must convene to resolve funding, fees, and loan issues (Group 1)
- Coordinating competency logs and securing appropriate HESA banding demands substantial staff time (Groups 3, 4)
- Institutions fear recruitment shortfalls, both students and specialist staff, funding cuts, validation fatigue, and loss of international fees, stretching limited resources further (Groups 5, 6)
- Mentoring quality varies, and hiring professionals with combined academic and industry expertise is increasingly difficult under current budgets (Group 6)

Q4. Implications of reduced leverage within HE institutions for these high-cost courses?

- Unresolved student fees and loan arrangements weaken institutional negotiating power and risk student access (Group 1)
- Eroded leverage over Part 1 threatens course quality if too much flexibility is introduced (Group 4)
- Ambiguity in the PPE framework leaves schools without a clear mandate, undermining their ability to influence outcomes (Group 6)

Q5. Should we consider a re-run of the survey, which Russel supported, to obtain a follow-up view now that the PPE report is published?

- Yes, a follow-up SCOSA survey would capture shifts in institutional approaches and help crystallise emerging best practices (Groups 3, 5, 6)

Recommendations:

A) Emerging models

1. **Publish 2-3 sector-endorsed ‘template’ pathways (e.g. 3 + 2, 4 + 1, 5-year fully-integrated) with agreed entry/exit points and funding codes.**
Lack of a standard model is already pushing schools to invent idiosyncratic solutions, something several groups warn could destabilise the market and confuse applicants.
2. **Keep robust ‘on-/off-ramps’ and standalone Part 1 options inside any integrated route.**
Rural and widening-participation providers stress that many students need flexibility to pause for work, caring or visa reasons.
3. **Commission a rapid equality-impact study - via SCOSA- on the effects of accelerated 4-year formats before they are rubber-stamped.**
Group-5 institutions note that a ‘race to the fastest course’ may disadvantage mature, lower-income and international cohorts, and ask SCOSA to gather hard data first.
4. **Lobby Student Finance England (and the devolved nations) to extend full support to Primer/Foundation routes for non-cognate entrants.**
Several schools are ready to pilot six-month ‘up-skilling’ courses but cannot proceed while funding is blocked.
5. **Issue national guidance on evidence of ‘competency at entry’.**
Without shared criteria, inequities will widen; groups propose a portfolio-plus-interview model mapped to the ARB matrix.

B) Professional Practice Experience / Record of Competency (PPE/ RoC)

1. **Co-design a single, openly-licensed digital RoC platform rather than outsourcing to a private consultancy.**
Groups applaud the idea of a trainee-led, real-time logbook with a central repository, but see outsourcing as costly and detached from educational nuance.
2. **Map placement modules directly to RoC competencies and train practice mentors.**
Some already credit-rate assessed placements; extending that model would let experience count academically and raise mentor quality.
3. **Re-set ARB’s implementation timetable and run pilot cohorts first.**
Multiple groups label the current deadlines ‘over-complicated’ and ‘unrealistic’.
4. **Create a standing SCOSA-ARB-Practice task-force, including a register of approved training practices.**
A formal forum is seen as essential for iterative design and for ensuring consistent placement quality across the UK.

C) Challenges & opportunities

1. **Adopt a phased roll-out (minimum 18–24 months per validation cycle) with waiver options for early pilots.**
Schools warn that internal approvals, visa compliance and TEF reporting cannot be compressed further without risking quality.
2. **Secure ring-fenced resource for high-cost architecture provision and adjust HESA/TEF frameworks accordingly.**
Institutions fear that integrated programmes will look like ‘expensive outliers’ once re-coded; explicit funding recognition and TEF adjustments are required.
3. **Support rural and SME-practice regions through regional placement groups and ‘apprenticeship-light’ guidance.**
Some rural providers emphasise that London-centric models will not be effective in their context.

4. **Invest in a national pool of practitioner-academics and shared continuing professional development (CPD) to ease recruitment pressures.**

Several groups note difficulty attracting staff who can straddle academia and practice within current budgets.

5. **Re-run the SCOSA sector survey immediately after the PPE report to create an evidence base for lobbying.**

There is a cross-group appetite for updated, quantitative data on institutional plans and student demand.

2) Future planning for the SCOSA EDUCATION WORKING GROUP

Groups	Would you like this Group to continue?	What would you like it to do/Achieve?	How often should it meet?
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is it useful? How do we become influential? How do we strengthen the agency? Talking to the converted, we work like a therapy group, but how do we work at a higher level? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs a much higher representation. International names like Foster to put weight. Gov best way forward. We need to politicise things. Terms of reference for this group by SCOSA. Striking balance between people and effectiveness to reach conclusion. The more we can collectively put. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conversation needs to continue, but be practically relevant.
2	Nothing Written	Nothing Written	Nothing Written
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SCOSA should be encouraging a collective approach to , presenting a standard model to all schools of architecture will typically offer (3+2; 5 yr integrated masters? ...) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> monthly
4	Nothing Written	Nothing Written	Nothing Written
5	Nothing Written	Nothing Written	Nothing Written
6	Yes	Constency of changes for its members	Nothing Written

Summary of Future Planning for the SCOSA EDUCATION WORKING GROUP:

1. Would you like this group to continue?

There is a desire for the group to continue. Participants view ongoing conversations as important, although they emphasise that these must be practically relevant. Talking to the converted feels like a therapy group, but how do we work at a higher level?

3. What would you like it to do/achieve?

- Be influential and strengthen agency** – Move beyond internal discussions to impact external decision-making.
- Work at a higher level** – Seek greater representation and involve influential figures (e.g., international names like Foster).
- Engage politically** – There is a call to politicise issues and push back on current government and ARB approaches.
- Clarify SCOSA's role** – Define terms of reference, governance, and authority of the group.
- Coordinate responses** – Help schools form a collective and consistent stance on ARB reforms, possibly developing a shared LP (Learning Partnership) model.
- Lobby for flexibility** – Advocate to the ARB for relaxed deadlines to allow proper consultation and research.

4. How often should it meet?

- Ongoing engagement,
- Structured and effective outcomes,
- Coordination across stakeholders (e.g., Schools, APSA, RIBA).