

RIBA 

**Royal Institute of British Architects**

**Report of the RIBA Full visiting board  
to the University of Lima - 2022**

**Date of visiting board: 6, 7 & 8 July 2022**  
**Confirmed by the RIBA: 14 October 2022**

**1 Details of institution hosting courses**  
Department of Architecture  
Faculty of Architecture  
University of Lima  
Av. Javier Prado Este 4600  
Santiago de Surco, Lima, Peru

**2 Courses offered for validation**  
Bachelor Diploma in Architecture  
Professional Diploma in Architecture

**3 Head of the Department of Architecture**  
Enrique Bonilla Di Tolla

**Deputy Head of Department**  
Vanessa Zadel Velásquez

**Programme Directors**  
Mónica Baez Barriga  
Madeleine García Dacarett de Baracco  
Angeles Maqueira Yamasaki  
José del Carmen Palacios Aguilar

**4 Awarding body**  
The University of Lima

**5 The visiting board**  
Andrew C. Wilson - Chair  
Sara Shafiei – Vice Chair  
Sabine Storp

**In attendance:**  
Jaime Solloso – RIBA – validation manager

**6 Procedures and criteria for the online visit**  
The visiting board was carried out under the *RIBA procedures for validation and validation criteria for UK and international courses and examinations in architecture* (published July 2011, and effective from September 2011); this document is available at [www.architecture.com](http://www.architecture.com).

**7 Proposals of the visiting board**

The Board recommends to the RIBA Education Committee continued validation of the following courses:

The next visit to the University of Lima will take place in 2027.

**8 Standard requirements for continued recognition**

Continued RIBA recognition of all courses and qualifications is dependent upon:

- i external examiners being appointed for the course
- ii any significant changes to the courses and qualifications being submitted to the RIBA
- iii any change of award title, and the effective date of the change, being notified to the RIBA so that its recognition may formally be transferred to the new title
- iv submission to the RIBA of the names of students passing the courses and qualifications listed
- v In the UK, standard requirements of validation include the completion by the of the annual statistical return issued by the RIBA Education Department

**9 Academic position statement (written by the School)**

Universidad de Lima was founded in 1962, driven by a philosophy aiming at searching the scientific truth and preparing highly skilled professionals with a humanistic culture and continuous update and improvement while educating them under ethical standards and democratic principles. The motto in the University coat of arms, Scientia et Praxis, leads our education activity: the generation of knowledge cannot be separated from concrete action courses which are the bases of useful and necessary professions for sustainable development. In 2019, 57 years after its foundation, Universidad de Lima renewed this purpose by declaring their *raison d'être* is “to inspire the country with new forms of entrepreneurship”. The new business is focused on ethics, continuous improvement, interdisciplinary work, digital transformation, mutual respect, social responsibility, care for the environment, tolerance, active listening and change management. Universidad de Lima is and will always be a space for open dialogue, free thinking and expression, creativity and productivity, entrepreneurship, and research with a true commitment to the country.

Architecture Program characteristics and practice areas

Peru is a country of highly diverse landscapes, ecosystems (separate or bundled) with several anthropogenic aspects such as cultural expressions, human settlement patterns or rural-urban dynamics. The cities of Peru concentrate 78% of the population, and most cities are located in a semi-arid, desertic coast concentrating 58% of the population out of which 30% is concentrated in Lima, the capital city. Planning of these cities has been poor. For instance, 70% of Lima’s urban center is the result of informal building processes that, in turn, generate economic, social, and environmental problems.

Upon this reality, the Architecture Program embraces the purpose of Universidad de Lima and extrapolates it into thinking of and proposing new ideas to make the city better from an architecture approach: new ways to design, manage and build environmentally friendly sustainable buildings. Management is a highly emphasized aspect that differentiates the program where architecture projects are intended to be managed with social, economic,

and environmental responsibility to generate a positive impact on the environment.

As for the Program most important characteristics, we have the following:

- The Program has 10 academic semesters
- The curricular matrix is divided into 4 levels:
  - Vocational training level
  - Education level
  - Professional level
  - Thesis level
- The student must complete 214 credits (196 required and 18 elective) to finish the Program.
- The courses are structured into six academic areas:
  - Architecture Design
  - History and Theory of Architecture
  - Construction and Structures
  - Communications
  - Project Management
  - Urban Planning & Environment
- The students can enroll in elective courses from other programs and get counseling by professors from other programs and schools.
- Business management courses have public and social components.

## **10 Commendations**

- 10.1** The board commends the collegiate nature of the school and the sense of community created for students by staff and senior management, as well as the excellent level of support for students provided by staff throughout their academic journey and preparation for employment.
- 10.2** The board commends the departments core ethical values and embracing of the RIBA Themes and Values in relation to its city, region and community understanding.
- 10.3** The board commends the effort in adapting and preparing for the RIBA visit including engaging students in understanding the RIBA criteria.

## **11 Conditions**

There are no conditions/ etc

## **12 Action points**

The visiting board proposes the following action points. The RIBA expects the university to report on how it will address these action points. The university is referred to the RIBA's criteria and procedures for validation for details of mid-term monitoring processes. Failure by the university to satisfactorily resolve action points may result in a course being conditioned by a future visiting board.

- 12.1** The school must write an academic position statement in line with RIBA guidance and recommendations on format. The academic position statement content should also better reflect the distinctive qualities of the school, its ambitions, ethos, and identity more accurately, in relationship to the validated courses.

**12.2** The school must map its architecture programme against RIBA general criteria and graduate attributes to more accurately reflect how its content and delivery on all modules explicitly reflect at least 50% design. The mapping must include PFC assignment (Professional Diploma in Architecture).

**13 Advice**

The visiting board offers the following advice to the School on desirable, but not essential improvements, which, it is felt, would assist course development and raise standards.

**13.1** The board strongly advises that the school appoint an experienced external examiner with knowledge of RIBA Criteria, to review work and assessment method and offer guidance for enhancement at the end of each academic year. This is to support the School fully in its ambitions to be internationally positioned and benchmarked.

**13.2** The School should take steps to address the high workload of the students and the current curriculum imbalance of credits between design and non-design modules. The school is thus strongly advised to explore the potential for integration of learning between the studio and other areas of the curriculum. Urbanism, history and theory, structures, technology, environment and sustainability can all be in-part taught and assessed through studio projects.

**13.3** The School should reflect on the high workload set and extent and nature of information typically presented in portfolios: there is a high degree of repetition of similar information. There is opportunity to create space for exploratory process work within portfolios and to place emphasis on presentation quality, as opposed to quantity, in final representations.

**13.4** The Board advises that design portfolios are more critically edited with students encouraged to become more critically reflective at key points in their design process enabling a concise and focussed presentation of their design portfolio.

**13.5** The Board notes the good levels of creativity and ambition in the work in the years 1, 2 and 3 and encourages the school to create space in Year 4 and Year 5 to continue to support this. It would be possible to combine, or connect, Semester 9 and 10 to create a bigger space in which to be experimental and ambitious in architectural, tectonic and environmental thinking.

**13.6** In years 4,5 and 6, the Board strongly advises the School to integrate materiality and tectonics as part of the design projects, testing materials and construction methods in an innovative way to enable the students to explore new ways of application.

**13.7** The Board strongly advises the school to strive to build on the existing competence of students to encourage greater ambition and experimentation in their design in relation to ecological sustainability, inspired by local materials, climate and construction techniques with ethical standpoint throughout their studies.

- 13.8** The Part 1 element is currently mapped to semester 7 of the Bachelors course and the Board is able to advise that this is an appropriate assessment of the course outcomes at this stage. However, it is important to advise that Part 1 cannot be formally confirmed or offered to students until the completion and awarding of the full Bachelors degree.
- 13.9** The School should explore the opportunity to enable credit bearing international exchange within the 5 year bachelor course. There is space within the course to do this. The students highly value the opportunity, but this currently requires additional effort and some compromise on learning.
- 13.10** The school is encouraged to invest in the development of a student society to enable the students to establish a support network within their own community and help develop more opportunities for communication and exchange within the student body

**14 Delivery of graduate attributes**

It should be noted that where the visiting board considered graduate attributes to have been met, no commentary is offered. Where concerns were noted (or an attribute clearly not met), commentary is supplied. Finally, where academic outcomes suggested a graduate attribute was particularly positively demonstrated, commentary is supplied.

**14.1 Part 1**

The Board confirmed that all Part 1 graduate attributes were met.

**15 Review of work against criteria**

It should be noted that where the visiting board considered a criterion to have been met, no commentary is offered. Where concerns were noted (or a criterion clearly not met), commentary is supplied. Finally, where academic outcomes suggested a criterion was particularly positively demonstrated, commentary is supplied.

**16 Other information**

**16.1 Student numbers (from the School)**

Semester 2022-1: 1375 students.

**16.2 Documentation provided**

The Department provided all documentation as required by the Procedures for Validation.

**17 Notes of meetings**

On request, the RIBA will issue a copy of the minutes taken from the following meetings: **These notes will not form part of the published report but will be made available on request. The full set of notes will be issued to the mid-term panel and the next full visiting board.**

- Meeting with budget holder and course leaders
- Meeting with students
- Meeting with the head of institution

- Meeting with external examiners
- Meeting with staff