
Royal Institute of British Architects

**Report of the RIBA visiting board to
Pontificia Universidad Javeriana**

1 Details of institution hosting course/s **(report part A)**

Facultad de Arquitectura Y Diseño
Pontificia Universidad Javeriana
Carrera 7a No 40-62
Bogotá DC
Colombia

2 Head of Architecture Group

Alfonso Gomez Gomez

3 Course/s offered for revalidation

Programme of Architecture (5 years, 10 semesters), Parts 1 and 2

4 Course leader/s

Giovanni Ferroni del Valle, Dean
Alfonso Gomez Gomez, Head of the program
Luz Mery Rodelo Torres, Director of the Department of Architecture

5 Awarding body

Pontificia Universidad Javeriana

6 The visiting board

Sally Stewart	Chair
Alex Wright	
Lilly Kudic	
Nick Hayhurst	
Architect. Mr. Gabriel Nagy	Regional representative
Sophie Bailey	RIBA Validation Manager

7 Procedures and criteria for the 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.

8 Proposals of the visiting board

On the 15 February 2017 the RIBA Education Committee confirmed that the following courses and qualifications are validated unconditionally revalidated:

Programme of Architecture (5 years, 10 semesters), Parts 1 and 2

This proposal will be submitted to the RIBA Education Committee for ratification, and subsequent notification to RIBA Council.

The next RIBA visiting board will take place in: 2021

9 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 institution of the annual statistical return issued by the RIBA Education Department

10 Academic position statement

(Statement written by the school)

The Architecture program, as well as all the programs of the University, bases its curriculum in coherence with the Mission of the University:

The Pontificia Universidad Javeriana is a Catholic higher education institution, founded and directed by the Society of Jesus, committed to the educational principles and the guidelines of the founding entity. It exercises teaching, research and service with excellence, as a University integrated to a region-based country, under a global and interdisciplinary perspective, and its purpose is:

- The well-rounded education of individuals who stand out due to their human, ethical, academic and professional high quality, as well as due to their social responsibility; and,
- The creation and development of knowledge and culture from a critical and innovating perspective in order to achieve a fair, sustainable, inclusive, democratic society that respects human dignity.

The social focus of the Architecture Undergraduate Program is shown in a transversal manner in all the courses while having a special emphasis on project types such as “Ubicar (solutions for people displaced by violence)”, “Popular Housing” (“Vivienda Popular,” “New Territories” (“Nuevos Territorios”), “Ecosocial Architecture” (“Arquitectura Ecosocial”), “International Experimental Project – IEP” (“Proyecto Experimental Internacional - PEI”), and “Human Space” (“Espacialidad Humana”). In addition, it is one of the identity factors of the research projects developed at the Departments of the School.

One of the missions of the Society of Jesus, personal accompaniment, or cura personalis, is part of the Ignatian charisma. In the Architecture Undergraduate Program, this accompaniment is personalized through the Academic Counselling program in which expert professors lead the students in a personalized manner along their academic path in order

to give advice concerning the selection of the most adequate study plan according to their personal interests, or guiding them to solve personal or family problems that may affect their academic performance. This is work carried out jointly with Academic Counselling, the Academic Vice-presidency and the Welfare and Community psychology services, the pastoral center, student groups, the sports center, the center for cultural management, etc. Academic counselling has become a great mechanism for lowering student dropping out; at the School of Architecture and Design we have one of the lowest rates thanks to this program, 22.1%, in relation to 38.32% at the University.

The well-rounded education is reflected on the study plan in the courses of the Foundation Core of part 1, in the projects of part 2, in the complementary and in the elective courses.

The Departments that render teaching services to the Architecture Undergraduate Programs are: Administration, Architecture, Art, Rural Development, Design, Mathematics, Aesthetics, and the Center for Theological Education, Philosophy and Civil Engineering. Students can take courses from the other departments of the University as Electives. Thus, the courses taken by the Architecture students as part of their study plan belong to different knowledge domains. The School of Architecture and Design has three Departments: Architecture, Aesthetics and Design. The Departments are also in charge of research, continuing education, and consultancy.

The second-cycle projects are comprehensive; they are taught jointly by several professors (four to five depending on the project) and each one of them is an expert in an area: Architectural Design, Technology, the Environment, Urbanism, Aesthetics, Management, etc. Each week, the students hold a session with each professor and a joint session with all of them at the same time in order to have a discussion about the ongoing projects.

The complementary option courses (12 credits) allow the students to complement their education with areas related to Architecture so they can take courses freely from the Departments of Design, Administration, Philosophy, Arts, Urban Ecology, Civil Engineering and Economics.

Experience-based learning is an essential part of the curriculum. The students develop 1:1-scale projects from the first semester onwards, and in the different project classes they have real contact with the communities and different regions of the country making a contribution to the solution of real problems as those they work with in the International Experience Program - IEP in Palomino, Caimalito, the Solar Decathlon contest, etc.

The students have the chance to choose the courses according to their personal interests thus favoring the flexibility of the curriculum. The success of this modality is achieved with the accompaniment of the Academic Counsellors.

At the end of the second cycle, the students can take part in the Double Degree Program with the Politecnico di Torino, by substituting the last

year of the Program with two years of a Master's Degree program. They obtain the degree as architects in Colombia along with the Master's Degree. They can also take co-terminal courses at the different Master's Degree programs of the University which are acknowledged at the undergraduate program as emphasis courses, complementary options and/or elective courses while establishing a connection with the post-graduate program they prefer.

Our alumni have great influence on the history of Architecture, both at national and international levels. These achievements are included in the book "El Hacer del Arquitecto Javeriano" (The Work of the Javeriana Architect).

The graduation project, as personal development, provides the students with the opportunity to choose the topic according to their personal interests, as well as the chance to select the director of their graduation project. These projects are linked to the lines of research of the Department of Architecture and of the Department of Design.

11 Commendations

The visiting board made the following commendations:

- 11.1 The board commends the school on their commitment to specialist input within the groups of second cycle projects.
- 11.2 The board commends the school on the choice and diversity of pathways within the second cycle.
- 11.3 The board commends the school in pursuing opportunities for experienced based learning especially those involving design and construction.

12 Conditions

There are no conditions

13 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. Failure by the university to satisfactorily resolve action points may result in a course being conditioned by a future visiting board.

- 13.1 The board recommends that in preparation for the next RIBA validation board that the school puts in place processes to support the student body in the development of a Student Appraisal document.
- 13.2 The board recommends for future RIBA boards that all key documentation including all module descriptors are made available in English.
- 13.3 The board recommends the school considers how it can put in place a form of external scrutiny on an annual basis, that helps foster sustained standards and consistency, particularly in relation to the second cycle both in the final degree project and within the four proceeding design

semesters. The school should also consider what form of annual appraisal or documentation this would lead to.

13.4 The board strongly recommends that the school considers ways of developing the final degree project so that it demonstrates greater coherent spatial and technological synthesis and progression from the work of the design work carried out in semesters five to eight.

13.5 The board strongly recommends the school consider how end of project reviews, at all levels, may be made available more widely to staff and students, and how this may provide opportunities for peer to peer review and discussion through careful rescheduling and selection of appropriate review space.

14. Advice

14.1 The board advises that the school develop a moderation process to ensure equity in the application of assessment criteria and grade descriptors across teaching groups.

14.2 The board recommends that the school considers the introduction of an extended essay within the second cycle which ensures that each student is able to produce clear logically argued and original written work relating to architecture culture, theory and design (Graduate Attribute GA2.4).

14.3 The board recommends the school consider how the comprehensive exhibiting of student work as generated for the RIBA visiting board may provide a significant pedagogic tool across cycles one and two.

14.4 The board welcomes the objective of the long term university estate masterplan to provide additional physical resources for the faculty of architecture. However, the board urges the institution to recognise the pressing need for additional appropriate work and exhibition space to allow the faculty to provide a studio education of the appropriate quality.

14.5 The board advises the school to consider whether clearer definition of the achievement of the graduate attributes at Part 1 midway within the programme may better facilitate international mobility and collaborations.

14.6 The board advises the school to consider how the flexibility inherent in the group system in semesters five to eight can be used to respond to student demand, while establishing a process of critical review and enhancement of the group offerings.

15 Delivery of academic position

The following key points were noted: the board felt that the statement covered areas of activity and specific outcomes that the school would wish to be considered as exceptional and the features of teaching and learning that characterise and distinguish the courses offered when considered against other schools of architecture.

16 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.

Graduate Attributes for Parts 1 and 2

The Board confirmed that all of the Part 1 graduate attributes were met by graduates of the Programme of Architecture. Please see advice point 14.2 regarding the Part 2 graduate attributes.

17 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.

Graduate Criteria for Parts 1 and 2

The Board confirmed that all of the Parts 1 and 2 graduate criteria were met by graduates of the Programme of Architecture.

18 Other information

18.1 Student numbers

ADMISIONES	2016-3	2016-1	2015-3	2015-1	2014-3	2014-1	2013-3	2013-1	2012-3	2012-1	2011-3	2011-1	2010-3	2010-1
INSCRIPCIONES														
Total Número de personas inscritas	545	979	531	697	444	592	454	628	551	719	520	664	491	593
<i>Personas con formulario completo</i>	362	648	371	451	338	436	338	457	386	467	403	458	403	438
PRUEBAS ESPECIFICAS														
Corte icfes	310	340	320	332	360	377	359	383	381	388	371	400	340	355
Llamados a presentar Pruebas Especificas	291	281	258	250	242	256	251	253	256	243	264	277	281	253
Personas que no asistieron a Pruebas	28	52	29	23	22	19	17	25	18	35	39	40	17	22
ENTREVISTAS														
Personas llamadas a entrevistas	-	-	-	-	-	-	11	205	184	208	225	205	215	236
No asistieron a entrevista	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	5	7	1	8	2	6	6
ADMISIONES														
<i>Cupo Preferencial - icfes</i>	9	10	10	10	19	19	22	10	10	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Preuniversitario</i>	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	20	33	20
<i>Uso Reservas de Cupo</i>	23	9	6	10	15	9	5	6	6	10	10	10	7	10
<i>Admitidos</i>		90	84	80	66	81	73	84	87	90	74	80	70	82
TOTAL CUPOS	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	103	100	100	110	110	112
MATRICULAS	2016-3	2016-1	2015-3	2015-1	2014-3	2014-1	2013-3	2013-1	2012-3	2012-1	2011-3	2011-1	2010-3	2010-1
Corte establecido en comité de admisiones	134	161	156	150	160	151	140	130	131	123	96	110	85	83
Lista de Espera	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	21	28	19	-	-	-
Estudiantes que solicitaron reserva de cupo	-15	-19	-23	-17	-13	-28	-12	-13	-16	-15	-17	-12	-9	-11
Estudiantes admitidos que no se matricularon	-44	-49	-42	-56	-27	-12	-27	-43	-45	-39	-4	-17	-35	-16
Total que no ingresaron	-59	-68	-65	-73	-40	-40	-39	-56	-61	-54	-21	-29	-44	-27
% de no Ingreso	-44,03	-42,24	-41,67	-48,67	-25,00	-26,49	-27,86	-38,36	-40,13	-35,76	-18,26	-26,36	-51,76	-32,53
Estudiantes Matriculados	106	120	108	93	133	111	102	109	102	97	102	115	111	110

ESTUDIANTES ACTIVOS		RETIROS TEMPORALES		RETIROS DEFINITIVOS		EXCLUSIONES	
PERIODO	TOTAL MATRICULADOS	TOTAL RETIROS TEMPORALES	% ESTUDIANTES RETIRO TEMPORAL	TOTAL RETIROS DEFINITIVOS	% ESTUDIANTES RETIRO DEFINITIVO	TOTAL EXCLUIDOS	% ESTUDIANTES EXCLUIDOS
2010-1	971	62	6,39	8	0,82	10	1,03
2010-3	1008	59	5,85	9	0,89	6	0,60
2011-1	962	59	6,13	4	0,42	6	0,62
2011-3	1049	50	4,77	6	0,57	7	0,67
2012-1	1063	59	5,55	4	0,38	6	0,56
2012-3	1098	57	5,19	3	0,27	6	0,55
2013-1	973	68	6,99	7	0,72	3	0,31
2013-3	974	59	6,06	6	0,62	6	0,62
2014-1	988	52	5,26	3	0,30	7	0,71
2014-3	997	60	6,02	8	0,80	5	0,50
2015-1	982	50	5,09	9	0,92	3	0,31
2015-3	964	46	4,77	9	0,93	5	0,52
2016-1	1082	33	3,05	3	0,28	4	0,37
TOTAL			4,00	50	0,38	57	0,43

18.2 Documentation provided

All required RIBA documentation was provided prior the visit.

*Notes of meetings

On request, the RIBA will issue a copy of the minutes taken from the following meetings:

- **Budget holder and course leaders**
- **Students**
- **Head of institution**
- **External examiners**
- **Staff**