



Subject	The Prescribed Examination and extended Transitional Arrangements for Candidates		
Status	Open Session		
Purpose	For Decision		
From	Prescription Committee		
History	Parent Committee	First Submitted	Revision Number
	Prescription Committee	February 2015	1

If you have any enquiries on this paper, please contact Teresa Graham on 020 7580 5861

1. Purpose

To inform the Board that it is appropriate to apply extended transitional arrangements to a small number of candidates who were affected by changes made to the methodology used for assessing eligibility for the Prescribed Examination.

2. Recommendation

It is recommended that the Board:

- i. The Board agrees that extended transitional arrangements be applied to the Prescribed Examination process and endorses the statement attached in Annex A which sets out the transitional arrangements that will be put in place for those candidates who meet the criteria set forth.

3. Terms of Reference

ARB's Prescribed Examination route is delivered in line with Section 4 of The Architects Act 1997.

Section 4 states:

"1. A person who has applied to the Registrar in the prescribed manner for registration in pursuance of this section is entitled to be registered if-

(a) he holds such qualifications and has gained such practical experience as may be prescribed; or

(b) he has a standard of competence which, in the opinion of the Board, is equivalent to that demonstrated by satisfying paragraph (a).

2. The Board may require a person who applies for registration on the ground that he satisfies subsection (1)(b) to pass a prescribed examination in architecture..."

4. Open Session

N/A

5. Contribution to the Board's Purpose and Objectives

In delivering the Act, ARB's objectives are:

Protect the users and potential users of architects' services: we ensure that architects are appropriately qualified and have undertaken appropriate qualifications or demonstrated an equivalent standard of competence before being admitted to the Register.

6. Risk Implications

Failure to address arrangements may expose the Board to challenges and reputational risks. Risks are limited to a finite number of graduates.

7. Key Points

- i. In July 2012 the Board made a number of changes to the Examination Procedures, including the amendments to the methodology for assessing eligibility to sit the Examination.
- ii. Under the Board's former procedures, candidates with qualifications not strictly in architecture which may have included some non cognate modules, generally had access to the Prescribed Examination subject to assurances from the awarding institute that the candidate has covered equivalent ground to that of a Part 1 qualification.
- iii. The methodology for checking eligibility was enhanced and more scrutiny applied. It is important to note that the core of the eligibility requirements for the examination have not been altered.
- iv. Transitional arrangements for the run out of the previous procedures and introduction of the revised procedures were in place between January and July 2012. The first examinations under the revised process took place in July 2012.
- v. Although transitional arrangements were in place, correspondence from SCHOSA indicated that not all those affected by these amendments took up the opportunity to be examined before the new amendments came into force.
- vi. At its meeting on 27 November 2014, the Committee noted a request from SCHOSA to reconsider the methodology for assessing eligibility for some candidates wishing to sit the Prescribed Examination.
- vii. Among these candidates, are those who had a reasonable expectation on commencing their programme of study that they would be able to sit the Prescribed Examination on its completion. In some cases, individual students passing the Prescribed Examination were from the same cohort as those now deemed ineligible to sit the examination.

- viii. The Committee agreed to write to SCHOSA in order to initiate further discussions.
- ix. A meeting with SCHOSA representatives took place on 16 January 2015. It was agreed that a proposal for revised transitional arrangements would be submitted to the Committee with a view to a recommendation to the Board. The points below are those agreed on that basis.
- x. The general consensus at the meeting suggested the number of candidates who may have been disadvantaged by the changes is probably low, but we must be mindful that extending the transitional arrangements could raise a more general and incorrect perception of eligibility amongst those who are not encompassed by the extended arrangements: this will need careful management.
- xi. The proposed transitional arrangements would also apply to overseas candidates who may have been disadvantaged by this change.
- xii. It was agreed with SCHOSA that there would be no cut-off date for transitional arrangements as there is no time restriction applied to any of the Board's prescribed qualifications. It was accepted that numbers would naturally wither with time.
- xiii. It was noted that any scrutiny fees paid by previously rejected candidates who now fall within the scope of the extended transitionals will be credited towards the cost of the Prescribed Examination.
- xiv. It was agreed with SCHOSA that all those who meet the criteria set out in these transitional arrangements and who have applied and denied access to the examination will be contacted by ARB accordingly. ARB and SCHOSA will also disseminate the statement to schools. ARB will inform schools who run non prescribed qualifications, (who meet the criteria) of these arrangements. The statement will also be placed on the Board's website.
- xv. It was also agreed with SCHOSA that ARB would draft the statement and circulate it to the SCHOSA members present at the meeting on the 16 January 2015 and the members have agreed the statement in [Annex A](#).
- xvi. The draft statement in [Annex A](#) was considered by the Prescription Committee at its meeting on 29 January 2015.
- xvii. The Board is asked that it agrees extended transitional arrangements be applied to the Prescribed Examination process and endorses the statement attached in [Annex A](#) which sets out the transitional arrangements that will be put in place for those candidates who fall within the scope.

8. Resource Implications

There will be extra demand for the Prescribed Examination, which will require additional resources but the Prescribed Examination is self-financed and therefore there will not be any additional costs incurred.

9. Communication

Demonstrates that the Board will reconsider its position in terms of fairness when required.

10. Equality and Diversity Implications

None identified