

Board Paper

for Open session

Subject:

Prescribed Examination

Board meeting:

22 July 2026

Agenda item:

10

Action:

- For noting ☐
- For discussion ☐
- For decision ☒

Purpose

This paper asks the Board to approve a six-week consultation on proposed changes to ARB's Registration Rules relating to the Prescribed Examination, together with draft Eligibility Guidance and draft Prescribed Examination Guidance.

Recommendations

The Board is asked to

1. Approve the consultation on proposed changes to
 - i) The Registration Rules relating to the Prescribed Examination
 - ii) Draft Eligibility Guidance
 - iii) Draft Prescribed Examination Guidance
2. Note the proposed approach to implementation of the new Prescribed Examination in spring 2027

Annexes

Annexe A – Draft amendments to Registration Rule 5

Annexe B – Draft Eligibility Guidance

Annexe C – Draft Prescribed Examination Policy

Author/Key Contact

Simon Howard, Director of Strategy – simonh@arb.org.uk

1. Open Session

2. Introduction

- 2.1. Section 4 of the Architects Act 1997 provides that a person may be entitled to registration if they hold prescribed qualifications and have gained prescribed practical experience, or if they have a standard of competence which, in the opinion of the Board, is equivalent to that demonstrated by satisfying those requirements.
- 2.2. The Act also permits the Board to require a person applying on the basis of equivalent competence to pass a prescribed examination in architecture.
- 2.3. ARB currently operates a Prescribed Examination for applicants who do not hold ARB-prescribed qualifications. The current examination reflects the former Part 1 and Part 2 criteria and is therefore no longer aligned with ARB's new outcomes-based framework for education and training.
- 2.4. The paper is brought to the Board because the current Prescribed Examination is based on the former Part 1 and Part 2 criteria and needs to be updated to reflect ARB's new outcomes-based framework for education and training.
- 2.5. The proposed changes would establish a revised Prescribed Examination assessing the Academic Outcomes. As this requires changes to the Registration Rules, and consultation on the proposed framework and supporting guidance, Board approval is required before the consultation can begin.
- 2.6. ARB has already consulted on the major policy change: moving from the previous Part 2 criteria to the Academic Outcomes. The proposed consultation would not reopen that broader policy question. Instead, it would consult on the Rules and guidance needed to implement an updated Prescribed Examination based on the Academic Outcomes.
- 2.7. The proposed new Prescribed Examination would provide a route for applicants who do not hold ARB-prescribed qualifications but who hold a Level 7 (RQF) qualification in architecture or a relevant discipline and wish to demonstrate an equivalent standard of academic competence.

3. The examination

- 3.1. The proposed examination would consist of:
 - (a) an Application stage, to determine eligibility;
 - (b) a Review stage, involving assessment of a self-assessment and portfolio of evidence against the Academic Outcomes; and
 - (c) an online Interview stage, to allow examiners to explore the applicant's evidence, understanding, judgment and professional insight.
- 3.2. The Prescribed Examination would assess the Academic Outcomes only. It would not assess the Practice Outcomes. Assessing Practice Outcomes would require ARB to operate what would effectively be a Part 3-style professional practice assessment. That would be a materially different route and should be considered separately as part of ARB's future corporate strategy, including any future practice-based route to registration.
- 3.3. The proposed approach is to require applicants to hold a Level 7 (RQF) qualification in architecture or a relevant discipline in order to be eligible to sit the Prescribed Examination. Applicants would then be assessed against the Academic Outcomes through the Review and Interview stages.
- 3.4. The proposed model would be delivered internally by ARB, supported by appointed examiners. This is considered more appropriate than outsourcing at this stage because future demand for the examination is uncertain. New routes to registration being developed by Learning Providers may include a more effective way of candidates demonstrating their prior learning before undertaking their Practice Outcomes qualification, rendering the need for a Prescribed Examination redundant.
- 3.5. If demand becomes significantly higher than expected in future years, ARB may need to review the delivery model. ARB does not intend to become an examination body at scale; the purpose of the Prescribed Examination is to provide recognition to those few individuals who have similar, albeit unaccredited, qualifications to those that are required, but without access to registration by the more traditional routes.
- 3.6. The proposed model is expected to be cheaper and more cost-effective than the current model.
- 3.7. Subject to the outcome of consultation and further Board approval, ARB would aim to implement the new Prescribed Examination in spring 2027. Before launch, ARB would pilot the model with examiners, provide examiner training and calibration, and develop supporting operational guidance, FAQs and procedures.

4. Proposed changes to the Registration Rules

- 4.1. The proposed Rule changes would replace the existing approach with a more flexible rule framework for prescribed examinations.

Overall, The draft Rule 5 would:

- (a) confirm ARB's power to require an applicant to undertake a prescribed examination;
- (b) allow the examination to assess the Academic Outcomes or other standards published by ARB for that purpose;
- (c) allow the examination to include eligibility assessment, portfolio assessment, written, in-person or online assessment, interview and verification of authorship or authenticity;
- (d) allow ARB to publish eligibility requirements, assessment criteria, procedures and guidance;
- (e) provide for examiners to be appointed by the Registrar;
- (f) provide for examiners to determine whether the required standard of competence has been demonstrated;
- (g) provide a narrow procedural review mechanism; and
- (h) allow ARB to charge fees published by ARB.

5. Eligibility Guidance

- 5.1. The draft Eligibility Guidance explains who would be eligible to sit the Prescribed Examination.
- 5.2. The purpose of the eligibility stage is not to determine whether an applicant has demonstrated the Academic Outcomes or whether they should be admitted to the Register. Those matters are assessed through the Prescribed Examination itself.
- 5.3. The eligibility stage is intended to help ensure that applicants have a realistic prospect of successfully demonstrating the Academic Outcomes through the Review and Interview stages. This is important because undertaking the Prescribed Examination requires a significant investment of time, effort and cost.
- 5.4. The proposed eligibility requirement is that applicants must hold a Level 7 (RQF) qualification in architecture or a relevant discipline.
- 5.5. This would be a clearer and more objective eligibility requirement than the current arrangements. Under the current Prescribed Examination, ARB may consider overseas qualifications on a case-by-case basis, including some overseas five-year

bachelor's degrees which may not be formally comparable to a Level 7 qualification in the UK. The proposed approach would instead rely on UK ENIC comparability to determine the level of the applicant's qualification. This would reduce the need for ARB to make its own judgments about the academic level and content of individual overseas qualifications at the eligibility stage, and would support greater consistency, transparency and defensibility in decision-making.

- 5.6. The effect of this change is that some applicants who may currently be eligible to sit the Prescribed Examination would not be eligible under the proposed new arrangements if their qualification is not assessed as comparable to Level 7. This is a substantive issue and will be specifically addressed in the consultation. Consultees will be asked whether the proposed Level 7 eligibility requirement is clear, fair and proportionate, including its potential impact on applicants with overseas qualifications.
- 5.7. Subject to the outcome of consultation, ARB would put in place transitional arrangements for applicants who are already in the current Prescribed Examination process before the new arrangements take effect. This would avoid unfairness to applicants who have already applied or been formally advised under the current requirements, while allowing the new eligibility framework to apply clearly to future applicants.
- 5.8. Eligibility to undertake the Prescribed Examination would not imply that the applicant has demonstrated the required standard of competence or that they will be successful in the examination.

6. Prescribed Examination Guidance

- 6.1. The draft Prescribed Examination Guidance explains the proposed structure and purpose of the examination for applicants.

The guidance explains:

- (a) the purpose of the Prescribed Examination;
- (b) the Academic Outcomes being assessed;
- (c) the assessment principles;
- (d) the Application, Review and Interview stages;
- (e) how evidence will be considered;
- (f) examination outcomes;
- (g) re-sits;
- (h) authenticity of evidence; and
- (i) procedural reviews.

7. Operational Guidance and supporting material

- 7.1. Further operational guidance and supporting material will be developed before launch. This is likely to include:
- a) portfolio of evidence and self-assessment guidance;
 - b) FAQs for applicants;
 - c) procedural review guidance;
 - d) examiner guidance;
 - e) examiner training and calibration materials;
 - f) guidance on authenticity, plagiarism and use of AI;
 - g) information about fees and payment arrangements;
 - h) information about deadlines and examination windows;
 - i) reasonable adjustments guidance;
 - j) internal procedures for examiner disagreement, moderation, record-keeping and quality assurance.
- 7.2. This supporting material will be developed during the implementation phase and, where appropriate, published on ARB's website before the examination opens for applications.

8. Consultation approach

- 8.1. A six-week consultation is proposed. This is shorter than the standard consultation period of three months but is considered appropriate because ARB has already consulted on the principal policy change: moving from the former Part 2 criteria to the Academic Outcomes.
- 8.2. The proposed consultation would focus on implementation, including:
- (a) the draft amendments to Registration Rule 5;
 - (b) the proposed eligibility requirements;
 - (c) the proposed structure of the examination;
 - (d) the proposed Review and Interview model;
 - (e) the proposed procedural review mechanism; and
 - (f) any equality, fairness or accessibility issues arising from the proposed approach.
- 8.3. The consultation would not reopen the broader policy question of whether ARB should move from the previous Part 2 criteria to the Academic Outcomes.

9. Equality and Diversity implications

- 9.1. The proposed changes are intended to provide a clear and fair route for applicants who do not hold ARB-prescribed qualifications but can demonstrate the Academic Outcomes through other Level 7 qualifications and evidence.
- 9.2. While The consultation will invite views on equality, fairness and accessibility. Particular attention will be given to the accessibility of an online interview process, applicants requiring reasonable adjustments, English language requirements and any disproportionate impacts arising from the eligibility criteria.
- 9.3. An equality impact assessment will be developed alongside the consultation and updated following consultation responses.

10. Risks and mitigations

- 10.1. Demand for the examination is uncertain. Although we are opening up eligibility by no longer requiring an undergraduate degree in architecture, we are anticipating that in time new qualifications being developed by Learning Providers will reduce the need for a Prescribed Examination. Nevertheless, we will be looking to establish sufficient examiners and examination dates to meet demand, which may initially be higher than we have previously experienced.
- 10.2. Reducing the number of examiners from three to two creates a greater risk of inconsistency in the new examination model. This risk will be mitigated through examiner training, and quality assurance.
- 10.3. There is a risk that unsuccessful applicants may seek to use procedural reviews as a means of challenging academic or professional judgment. This risk is mitigated by the proposed Rule 5 review provisions, which limit reviews to procedural impropriety, manifest unfairness or public law unreasonableness.

11. Communications

- 11.1. The consultation will be published on ARB's website and shared with relevant stakeholders, including learning providers, professional bodies, applicant groups and organisations representing internationally qualified applicants.
- 11.2. Communications will make clear that:
 - (a) ARB has already consulted on the move from Part 2 criteria to Academic Outcomes;

- (b) this consultation concerns the rules and guidance required to implement the updated Prescribed Examination;
- (c) the proposed examination assesses Academic Outcomes only;
- (d) ARB is seeking views on whether the proposed Rules and guidance are clear, fair and workable.

12. Recommendation

The Board is asked to

1. Approve the consultation on proposed changes to
 - i) The Registration Rules relating the Prescribed Examination
 - ii) Draft Eligibility Guidance
 - iii) Draft Prescribed Examination Guidance
2. Note the proposed approach to implementation of the new Prescribed Examination in spring 2027

5. Prescribed Examinations

5.1 For the purpose of determining whether a person has demonstrated a standard of competence equivalent to that required under section 4(1)(a) of the Act, pursuant to section 4(2) of the Act, ARB may require an applicant to undertake a prescribed examination.

5.2 A prescribed examination may assess whether an applicant has demonstrated the Academic Outcomes published by ARB, or any other standards, criteria or competencies published by ARB for this purpose.

5.3 A prescribed examination may consist of one or more of the following:

- (a) assessment of eligibility;
- (b) assessment of qualifications, training, professional experience or other evidence submitted by the applicant;
- (c) assessment of a portfolio or other documentary material;
- (d) written, in-person or online assessment or examination;
- (e) interview by one or more examiners appointed by the Registrar;
- (f) verification of the authenticity or authorship of material submitted by the applicant;
- (g) any other assessment method approved by ARB for the purpose of determining competence under section 4(1)(b) of the Act.

5.4 ARB may publish eligibility requirements, assessment criteria, procedures, guidance, evidential requirements and other arrangements relating to prescribed examinations.

5.5 An applicant shall comply with any procedures or requirements published by ARB in relation to a prescribed examination.

5.6 No applicant shall be entitled to undertake a prescribed examination unless they have paid such fees as may be published by ARB.

5.7 The Registrar shall appoint such examiners as they consider appropriate for the purpose of conducting prescribed examinations.

5.8 The examiners appointed by the Registrar shall determine whether the applicant has demonstrated the required standard of competence.

Reviews of decisions

5.9 An applicant may request a review of a decision made under rule 5.8 only on one or more of the following grounds:

- (a) material procedural impropriety in the conduct of the examination;
- (b) manifest unfairness;
- (c) that the decision was unreasonable in the public law sense.

5.10 A request for review under rule 5.9 must:

- (a) be made within 28 days of notification of the decision;
- (b) identify the ground or grounds relied upon;
- (c) set out the reasons for the request and include any supporting evidence; and
- (d) comply with any procedures published by ARB.

5.11 The Registrar may reject a request for review where satisfied that:

- (a) the request would not create a reasonable prospect of an alternative decision being reached following review;
 - (b) the request amounts only to disagreement with academic or professional judgment;
- or
- (c) the request is an abuse of process.

5.12 A review under rule 5.9 shall not constitute a reconsideration of academic or professional judgment except to the extent strictly necessary to determine the grounds of review.

5.13 A review under rule 5.9 shall be conducted by a person appointed by the Registrar who was not involved in the original examination decision.

5.14 Following a review under rule 5.9, the reviewer may:

- (a) confirm the original decision under review;
- (b) refer the applicant for further examination by the same or different examiners; or
- (c) make such other procedural directions as they consider appropriate.

5.15 The Registrar may refuse to accept an examination outcome made under rule 5.8 only where satisfied that there has been material procedural irregularity, manifest error, fraud, or other exceptional circumstance.

Eligibility Guidance

Introduction

This guidance explains the eligibility requirements for applicants seeking to undertake a prescribed examination under section 4(2) of the Architects Act 1997.

The purpose of the eligibility requirements is not to determine whether an applicant has demonstrated the Academic Outcomes or whether they should be admitted to the Register of Architects.

Those matters are assessed through the prescribed examination itself.

The eligibility requirements are intended to help ensure that applicants have a realistic prospect of successfully demonstrating the Academic Outcomes through the Review and Interview stages of the prescribed examination.

Undertaking the prescribed examination requires a significant investment of time, effort and cost. The eligibility requirements therefore serve an important protective function by helping applicants determine whether they are likely to possess the qualifications, experience and evidence necessary to engage meaningfully with the examination process.

Applicants who do not possess qualifications, training or professional experience of sufficient breadth, complexity or duration are unlikely to be able to provide the evidence necessary to demonstrate the Academic Outcomes successfully. In such circumstances, undertaking the examination is unlikely to be in the applicant's interests.

Prospective applicants are therefore encouraged to consider carefully whether they are able to demonstrate the required standard before applying to undertake the prescribed examination.

Eligibility to undertake a prescribed examination does not imply that the applicant has demonstrated the required standard of competence or that they will be successful in the examination.

2. Eligibility requirements

To be eligible to sit the Prescribed Examination, applicants must demonstrate either:

(a) successful completion of qualifications at Level 7 (RQF) (Master's degree level) in architecture or a relevant discipline; or

(b) substantial professional experience demonstrating engagement with architectural practice or the design and procurement of the built environment.

Applicants must provide such evidence as ARB may require in support of their application.

3. Qualifications

3.1 Level 7 (RQF) Qualifications

Applicants may be eligible where they hold qualifications at Level 7 (RQF) or an equivalent standard awarded in the United Kingdom or internationally.

Qualifications may include:

- Master's degrees;
- postgraduate diplomas;
- professional qualifications;
- or other advanced qualifications.

Qualifications do not need to be prescribed by ARB.

ARB will require applicants to provide evidence of their qualifications. Where qualifications were obtained outside the United Kingdom, ARB will require a Statement of Compatibility from UK ENIC ([Statement of Comparability | UK ENIC](#))

3.2 Relevant Disciplines

ARB will normally regard architecture as a relevant discipline.

ARB may also consider qualifications in related disciplines where the applicant can demonstrate substantial engagement with matters relevant to architecture or the built environment.

Relevant disciplines may include, but are not limited to:

- architectural technology;
- urban design;
- landscape architecture;
- interior architecture;
- civil or structural engineering;
- construction management;
- planning;

- or other built environment disciplines.

The existence of a qualification in a relevant discipline will not by itself establish eligibility.

5. Authenticity and Verification

ARB may take reasonable steps to verify the authenticity of qualifications, employment history, portfolio material or other evidence submitted in support of an application.

Where ARB reasonably suspects that false, misleading or fraudulent information has been submitted, ARB may:

- reject the application;
- discontinue the examination process;
- refuse registration;
- or take such other legal action as ARB considers appropriate.

6. English Language

Applicants must be capable of communicating effectively in English for the purposes of undertaking the prescribed examination.

Any applicant from a non-English speaking country must be able to speak English to C1 CEFR ([Assessment grid - English](#))

7. Equality and Reasonable Adjustments

ARB is committed to ensuring that the prescribed examination process is fair and accessible.

Applicants with a disability may request reasonable adjustments in accordance with ARB's published reasonable adjustments policy in advance of the examination.

8. ARB Discretion

The Registrar reserves the right to determine eligibility of any applicant, taking into account the individual circumstances of each application and the objectives of the prescribed examination process.

Prescribed Examination Policy Scheme

1. Introduction

1.1 The Academic Competency Outcomes Prescribed Examination (the exam) provides a route to registration for individuals who do not hold ARB-prescribed qualifications but believe they have developed an equivalent standard of knowledge, understanding and competence through other qualifications, professional experience or a combination of both.

1.2 The examination is established under section 4 of the Architects Act 1997. The Act provides that a person may be entitled to registration where they have a standard of competence which, in the opinion of ARB, is equivalent to that demonstrated by a person who has completed the prescribed qualifications and practical experience requirements. The Act also permits ARB to require applicants to pass a prescribed examination in architecture for this purpose. The examination is designed to assess whether an applicant can demonstrate the Academic Competency Outcomes published by ARB. These Outcomes set out the knowledge, skills and behaviours expected of an individual who has successfully completed the academic stages of architectural education required for registration.

1.3 Eligibility requirements to access the exam are published here [\[LINK\]](#).

2. Academic Competency Outcomes

2.1 The Competency Outcomes for Architects outlines the threshold competencies required for registration as an architect irrespective of the route taken to registration.



2.2 A link to Competency Outcomes for Architects can be found in Annex A: Useful Links at the end of this document.

3. Assessment Principles

3.1 The examination assesses whether applicants can demonstrate a standard of competence equivalent to that expected of a person who has successfully completed the academic stages of architectural education required for registration as an architect in the United Kingdom.

3.2 Applicants are responsible for providing sufficient evidence to demonstrate that they have met the Academic Competency Outcomes. Evidence may be drawn from a range of sources, including qualifications, professional practice, research, independent study, publications, technical reports, design projects, built work, professional activities and other relevant experience. Applicants are not expected to rely solely on architectural project work where other evidence is capable of demonstrating the Academic Competency Outcomes.

3.3 Examiners will assess the evidence provided as a whole. Applicants are not expected to demonstrate every Outcome through a single project, qualification or piece of work. Different Outcomes may be evidenced through different experiences and activities.

3.4 The examination is designed to assess applicants holistically. The Review and Interview stages are considered together, enabling examiners to evaluate both the evidence provided and the applicant's understanding, judgment and professional insight.

3.5 Applicants should focus on demonstrating the quality, relevance and breadth of their evidence rather than the volume of material submitted. Examiners will consider

whether the evidence demonstrates that the applicant has achieved the required standard of competence, rather than the quantity of evidence provided.

3.6 The burden of demonstrating competence rests with the applicant. Where insufficient evidence is provided, examiners may be unable to conclude that an Academic Competency Outcome has been demonstrated.

3.7 Examiners will exercise professional judgment when assessing applications. Decisions are based on the evidence provided and the extent to which that evidence demonstrates achievement of the Academic Competency Outcomes.

4. Examination Overview

4.1 There are three stages to the examination.



4.2 The purpose of the **Application** stage is to determine whether an applicant meets the eligibility requirements to undertake the examination.

4.3 The purpose of the **Review** stage is to assess the evidence provided by the applicant against the Academic Competency Outcomes. Applicants are required to submit:

- (a) a self-assessment explaining how they have met the Academic Competency Outcomes; and
- (b) a portfolio containing evidence supporting that self-assessment.

4.4 The purpose of the **Interview** stage is to enable examiners to explore the evidence provided during the Review stage, assess the applicant's understanding and professional judgment, and evaluate any areas where further clarification or evidence may be required.

4.5 The outcome of the examination will be as a result of the evidence provided at both the Review and Interview stages. Evidence submitted during the Review stage forms the foundation of the assessment, while the Interview enables applicants to explain, contextualise and expand upon that evidence.

4.6 Applicants who successfully complete the Application stage will be invited to proceed to the Review stage.

4.7 Applicants who provide sufficient evidence at the Review stage will be invited to proceed to the Interview stage.

4.8 Following completion of the Interview stage, the examiners will determine whether the applicant has demonstrated the Academic Competency Outcomes and therefore the required standard of competence.

5. Stage 1 - Application

5.1 The purpose of the Application stage is to determine whether an applicant has a realistic prospect of successfully demonstrating the Academic Competency Outcomes through the Review and Interview stages of the examination. It is not intended to determine whether an applicant has already demonstrated those Outcomes or whether they should be admitted to the Register. Those matters are assessed through the Review and Interview stages of the examination.

5.2 Eligibility requirements are set out separately in ARB's Eligibility Guidance.

5.3 ARB may request further information where reasonably necessary to determine eligibility.

5.4 Applicants are responsible for ensuring that the information and evidence submitted is accurate, complete and submitted by any applicable deadline.

Eligibility Decision

5.5 ARB will assess each application against the published eligibility requirements.

5.6 Applicants who satisfy the eligibility requirements will be invited to proceed to the Review stage.

5.7 Applicants who do not satisfy the eligibility requirements will not be permitted to proceed further with the examination.

5.8 Acceptance onto the examination does not imply that an applicant has demonstrated the Academic Competency Outcomes or that they will be successful in the examination.

6. Stage 2 - Review

6.1 The Review stage is the principal evidence gathering stage of the examination. It enables applicants to demonstrate how they have achieved the Academic Competency Outcomes through qualifications, professional experience, personal development, or a combination of these.

6.2 The purpose of the Review is to allow examiners to assess the breadth, depth and relevance of the applicant's evidence before proceeding to the Interview stage.

6.3 Applicants are required to submit:

(a) a self-assessment; and

(b) a portfolio of supporting evidence.

Self Assessment

6.4 The self-assessment requires applicants to explain how they have demonstrated each of the Academic Competency Outcomes.

6.5 Applicants should use the self-assessment to identify the evidence that supports each Outcome and explain how that evidence demonstrates the required knowledge, understanding, skills or behaviours.

6.6 The self-assessment should focus on the applicant's own contribution to architectural projects, academic learning and professional development. It should help examiners understand how the evidence provided relates to the Academic Competency Outcomes.

Portfolio of evidence

6.7 The portfolio of evidence should contain evidence that supports the self-assessment and demonstrates achievement of the Academic Competency Outcomes.

6.8 Evidence may be drawn from a range of sources, including:

- (a) academic study;
- (b) professional practice;
- (c) independent learning;
- (d) other relevant activities.

6.9 Applicants are not required to provide separate evidence for every Academic Competency Outcome. A single piece of evidence may demonstrate multiple Outcomes, and applicants may draw upon a range of evidence sources to demonstrate a particular Outcome.

6.10 Applicants should select evidence that best demonstrates the quality, relevance and complexity of their work. Examiners will assess the overall strength of the evidence rather than the volume of material submitted.

Assessment for evidence

6.11 Examiners will review the self-assessment and portfolio of evidence together.

6.12 Examiners will consider:

- (a) the extent to which the evidence demonstrates the Academic Competency Outcomes;
- (b) the relevance and quality of the evidence provided;
- (c) the applicant's explanation of how the evidence relates to the Outcomes; and
- (d) whether the evidence demonstrates a standard of competence equivalent to that required by the Academic Competency Outcomes.

6.13 Examiners may identify areas where further clarification, explanation or evidence is required. These areas may be explored further during the Interview stage.

Outcome of the Review

6.14 Applicants who provide sufficient evidence to enable further assessment of the Academic Competency Outcomes at Interview will be invited to proceed to the Interview stage.

6.15 Applicants who do not provide sufficient evidence to enable further assessment of the Academic Competency Outcomes will not progress to the Interview stage.

7. Stage 3 - Interview

7.1 The Interview will take place online and provides an opportunity for applicants to explain and contextualise the evidence contained within their self-assessment and portfolio. It also enables examiners to explore areas where further clarification may be required.

7.2 The Interview is a substantive part of the examination. The Review and Interview stages are considered together when determining whether an applicant has demonstrated the required standard of competence. During the Interview, applicants may be asked to explain, clarify or further demonstrate Academic Competency Outcomes that were not fully evidenced during the Review stage.

Assessment

7.3 During the Interview, examiners may:

- (a) ask applicants to explain evidence submitted during the Review stage;
- (b) test the veracity of the evidence submitted during the Review stage;
- (c) explore how particular Academic Competency Outcomes have been demonstrated;
- (d) seek clarification regarding the applicant's role, contribution or responsibilities in relation to projects or activities included within the portfolio;
- (e) discuss professional, ethical or practice-based scenarios relevant to the Academic Competency Outcomes; and
- (f) explore areas where additional evidence, explanation or context may be required.

7.4 Examiners may focus particular attention on Academic Competency Outcomes where the evidence submitted during the Review stage was less comprehensive or where further clarification is required.

7.5 Applicants should be prepared to discuss the evidence they have submitted and demonstrate how that evidence relates to the Academic Competency Outcomes.

8. Examination outcomes

8.1 The Interview is not assessed in isolation. Examiners will consider the evidence submitted during the Review stage together with the applicant's responses during the Interview.

8.2 Following the Interview, the examiners will determine whether the applicant has demonstrated the Academic Competency Outcomes and the required standard of competence.

8.3 Applicants who successfully demonstrate the required standard of competence will be informed of their successful outcome.

8.4 Applicants who do not demonstrate the required standard of competence will receive feedback identifying the Academic Competency Outcomes that were not sufficiently demonstrated.

9. Re-sits

9.1 Applicants who are unsuccessful at either the Review or Interview stage will receive feedback identifying the competencies that were not sufficiently demonstrated.

9.2 The purpose of feedback is to help applicants understand which Outcomes require further development, clarification or evidence before undertaking a further attempt.

9.3 Applicants may undertake a further attempt at an unsuccessful stage of the examination without making a new application, provided they remain within the period permitted for completion of the examination process.

9.4 Before undertaking a further attempt, applicants should carefully consider the feedback received and ensure that they are able to provide additional evidence,

explanation, learning or experience relevant to the Academic Competency

Outcomes identified.

9.5 A further attempt should not be regarded as an opportunity simply to repeat a previous submission or interview. Applicants are expected to address the matters identified in the feedback provided.

9.6 A fee is payable for each further attempt. Information about current fees is available on the ARB website.

9.7 Applicants must successfully complete all stages of the examination within [PERIOD]. Applicants who do not complete the examination within that period may be required to submit a new application before continuing.

10. Authenticity of evidence

10.1 Applicants must ensure that all information, statements and evidence submitted as part of the examination are accurate and truthful.

10.2 Applicants may submit evidence derived from collaborative projects, team activities or work undertaken on behalf of employers or clients. Where they do so, applicants must clearly identify their own role, responsibilities and contribution.

10.3 Applicants must not present the work, ideas or achievements of others as their own.

10.4 ARB may undertake such checks as it considers necessary to verify the authenticity of evidence submitted during the examination process.

10.5 Where ARB reasonably believes that evidence has been falsified, plagiarised, materially misrepresented or otherwise submitted dishonestly, ARB may:

- (a) reject the application;
- (b) determine that the applicant has not passed the examination; or

(c) take such other action as ARB considers appropriate.

11. Procedural Reviews

11.1 The Academic Competency Outcomes Prescribed Examination does not include a right of appeal against the academic or professional judgment of the examiners.

11.2 Applicants who are dissatisfied with an examination outcome may request a procedural review in accordance with the Registration Rules.

11.3 A procedural review is not a reconsideration of the evidence submitted or a re-assessment of the applicant's competence. Its purpose is to determine whether there has been a material defect in the examination process which may have affected the outcome.

11.4 A procedural review may only be requested on one or more of the following grounds:

- (a) material procedural impropriety in the conduct of the examination;
- (b) manifest unfairness; or
- (c) the decision was so unreasonable that no reasonable panel of examiners could have reached it.

11.5 Disagreement with the academic or professional judgment of the examiners, including disagreement about whether an Academic Competency Outcome has been demonstrated, does not by itself constitute grounds for a procedural review.

11.6 Requests for procedural review must be submitted within the period specified in the Registration Rules.

11.7 Where a procedural review identifies a material defect in the examination process, the outcome may be referred for further examination by the same or different examiners.

11.8 Further information about procedural reviews, including how to submit a request, is available in ARB's Procedural Review Guidance.

Annex A: Useful links

MyARB	[INSERT LINK]
-------	---------------

Portfolio & Interview Guidance	[INSERT LINK]
--------------------------------	---------------

Procedural Review	[INSERT LINK]
-------------------	---------------

Tomorrow's Architects:	[INSERT LINK]
------------------------	---------------

Competency Outcomes for Architects	
------------------------------------	--