

The discourse on admission policies as a theme within the overall context of architectural education worldwide is receiving considerable interest among design educators; nevertheless, the literature indicates there is a dearth of research in this area. (Salama 2015:84)

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1. INTRODUCING THE RESEARCHER

The researcher holds a professional Bachelor of Architecture and a Master of Interior Architecture (Research) degree from the University of Pretoria (hereafter **UP**). He started lecturing on a part-time basis in 1997 while working in private practice and was subsequently appointed in a permanent teaching position at the Department of Architecture of his alma mater in 2000. He has since led design studios, taught subject modules in the construction, visual literacy and design theory streams to students in all three¹ of the Department's undergraduate programmes and has acted as study leader and co-study leader for students pursuing their professional master's degrees in all three spatial design fields.

He coordinated the undergraduate and professional postgraduate programmes in interior architecture between 2001 and 2008 and managed undergraduate student administration until 2016. He currently leads the Department's interdisciplinary first-year design studio and is responsible for the undergraduate programme in architecture. He has convened selection for admission to all undergraduate programmes since 2005 and has done the same for the professional postgraduate programmes since 2012.

The researcher views himself as an intuitive designer and curious pragmatist. Apart from the research field of architectural education and the topic of this thesis, his academic interests include interdisciplinary design teaching, especially at foundation level, sensory and intuitive response development, visual communication as a design language, vernacular furniture typologies (which was the subject of the research for his master's dissertation), product design in general, and conservation, especially in urban

¹ The Department of Architecture presents a core curriculum with a homologous structure through coursework at both undergraduate and professional postgraduate levels in the spatial design fields of architecture, interior architecture and landscape architecture.

contexts. Between 1990 and 1993 he compiled and co-authored three published volumes on urban conservation studies in Pretoria with Prof. Schalk W. le Roux and later contributed to four conservation policy documents.

It is the view of the author that space making, as a cultural construct that should ultimately be user-centred, is a generative, interdisciplinary and collective act driven by abundant possibilities and multiple informants across many gauges. He believes that spatial design is a responsive discipline, formed and informed by context in the widest sense of the word, and that teaching and learning in the spatial design professions of the built environment should explore, exploit and actively engage with multivalent tenets, especially at the critical level of the foundation phase. This inclusive approach to an architectural pedagogy is neatly summarised when Le Roux (2006:98) asks “And how is learning to be achieved?”, to which he answers: “By dialogue and confrontation, confrontation with as wide a variety of architectures, as wide a variety of texts, as wide a variety of contexts, as wide a variety of scales, as wide a variety of approaches as possible.”

1.2. STUDY PROPOSAL AND STRUCTURE

1.2.1. Background to the study

This study is the result of the researcher’s active involvement in student selection for longer than a decade, albeit that it was not initially intended to become a thesis in this format. Early in 2005 the researcher was tasked by the (then) Head of the Department of Architecture, Prof. 'Ora Joubert, to investigate and improve the prevailing criteria and procedures for admission by selection to the Department’s undergraduate programme offerings. Joubert’s concern was sparked by apparent inconsistencies between the student intake and their graduation data, among other factors. The mandate – with hindsight essentially a free rein – prompted informal research that focussed on preliminary explorations and often intuitive investigations informed by recent admission data, institutional regulations and proto-testing during 2005 and 2006. The initial questions asked were **‘What do I expect a prospective student of architecture to know?’** and **‘Which skills do I expect a prospective student of architecture to have?’**. These were obviously escalated to **‘How do I, as an architect and educator, test these aspects?’**. At the time these questions were aimed at finding a feasible and equitable alternative to the prevailing selection practice as formulated by the Institution and employed by the Department.

The first cohort of beginner students who were selected under the new selection procedure commenced their studies in the 2007 academic year. In the following year the author was appointed to coordinate and lead the first-year design studio – this proved invaluable as it offered the opportunity for regular interaction with first-year students and enabled formal (through assessments and surveys) and informal (through observation and studio discussions) feedback cycles with beginner students. These, along with

managerial and logistical considerations, informed ongoing adjustments and tweaks within a framework of guidelines that were earlier established. By 2010, based on responses from staff and some external examiners, it became apparent that the new selection procedure had achieved some success in strengthening the general disposition of the student body at undergraduate level. Preliminary data on the standard academic indicators (academic results and the rates of attrition and graduation) had all shown remarkable improvements under the new selection regime and thus it seemed feasible to formalise research on the topic.

Part of this process was the discovery and ensuing exploration and systematising of archival sources² that evidenced the Department's historic selection processes for admission between 1971 and 1995, which re-introduced the author to procedures in which he participated as a prospective student early in 1987. The archival sources proved to be immensely rich informants, especially when one considers that there is generally a lack of available research on the topic of student selection for admission to studies in the architecture. According to the South African Council for the Architectural Profession (**SACAP**), there were eleven schools of architecture³ at ten public institutions of higher learning that presented validated programmes in architecture and architectural technology in South Africa in 2016 (SACAP 2017). Selection is the global norm⁴ used to admit students to academic programmes in architecture and it is therefore no surprise that all of the schools of architecture in South Africa admit students through screening and have, across the board, done so for a considerable time. In this context it is disconcerting that very little research has been published on the selection of students for admission to studies in architecture, especially in South Africa.

The opportunity for reflection, that had become a thesis, is a luxury that should not be read only as a (research) means to an end, but rather as part of an ongoing enquiry aimed at identifying the strongest cohort of beginner students to enter a specific academic programme at a specific institution of higher learning at the beginning of every academic year. There has never been any intention of finding a formulaic solution to the selection of students, but rather attempts were made to discover approaches that are contextually appropriate and developing measures and means that are relevant to the discipline of architecture in our time and place.

In light of recent interest in dialogue and research into architectural education in South Africa, it seems fitting to present this research at this time.

2 The archive of the Department of Architecture was established in 1966 and currently houses close to 80 significant physical and digital collections (Barker, Van Niekerk & Swart 2016:6). Prof Karel Bakker, then head of the Department, discovered some of the historic selection material in a storeroom in the basement of the Boukunde Building in 2011. More documents were discovered during June of 2017 when the Department moved out of the Boukunde Building to allow for extensive renovations. These items have now been accessioned to the archive with other sources on selection that were archived before.

3 SACAP officially refers to schools of architecture as 'Architectural Learning Sites' (abbreviated to ALS in the singular).

4 The exception usually occurs where access to free and equitable public education is constitutionally guaranteed, such as in Argentina.

1.2.2. General overview of the related literature

Where possible references have been included according to the Harvard method in the formats outlined in *Bibliographic style & reference techniques* by Burger (2010). In this study the literature is introduced and reviewed in the chapters where it is pertinent to the discussion. The following overview serves as an introduction to the literature related to the study as a whole.

Compared to other research topics that interest educators in architecture, literature on contemporary practice in selection for admission to schools of architecture is scarce and intermittent, especially for research emanating from South Africa or the African continent. Contrary to the scarcity of such literature on the architectural front, recent home-grown research on student selection is quite accessible. It addresses selection for tertiary students in general⁵ terms, as well as admission to specific academic programmes⁶ presented at South African universities. Apart from the transformation agenda relevant to a post-Apartheid context, a recent upsurge in research on admission and selection was driven by the introduction of the National Senior Certificate (**NSC**)⁷ which has marked the final year of secondary schooling in South Africa from 2008 onwards. This research is overwhelmingly based on admission procedures that are driven by quantitative considerations that have an explicit relationship with the programme content and are therefore easy to define or defend. This is not the case with architecture.

A number of references that address broader issues in architectural education make incidental or supplemental references to selection as part of arguments and narratives that focus on other topics, especially the history of architectural education. Such references can be found in literature that pertains to the European precedents that are considered to have established and developed studio-based education, namely the *École des Beaux-Arts* – and its predecessors the *Académie Royale d'Architecture* and the *Académie des Beaux-Arts*; see Egbert (1980:xxi-xxii) – and the Bauhaus. The gruelling competitions held to admit students to the French Beaux-Arts institutions are discussed in almost every source that cares for its pedagogic influence, from Weatherhead (1941), who scrutinises the *École* for its influence on architectural education in the United States, to Broadbent (1995), whose essay is a précis of architectural education and its development in the Western world. Similarly, the history of the Bauhaus has been comprehensively documented. Its admission policies can be extracted from its academic programmes and statutes that have been collated, translated and published in an exhaustive archival document by Wingler (1969). Other studies, like the one by Wick (2000), *Teaching at the Bauhaus*, offer further analysis and points of interest, although they are generally sparse on issues of admission.

5 See, for example: Mabokela (1997); Maree (2003); Visser and Hanslo (2005); Van der Merwe and De Beer (2006); Wiese, Van Heerden and Jordaan (2010); Wilson-Strydom (2012).

6 See, for example: In business and commerce: Kotzé and Griessel (2008), and Rankin, Schöer, Sebastiao and Van Walbeek (2012); in chemistry: Potgieter and Davidowitz (2010); in dentistry Ebersöhn and Maree (2003); in industrial design: Oosthuizen (2007); in medicine: Essack, Wedekind and Naidoo (2012); Van Zyl, Gravett and De Bruin (2012), Naidoo, Flack, Naidoo and Essack (2014) and Sommerville (2014); in the natural sciences: Maree, Fletcher and Sommerville (2011); in optometry: Mashige, Rampersad and Venkatas (2014); in statistics: Latief and Bignaut (2008).

7 The following examples illustrate research that relate to the higher education sector's responses to the introduction of the NSC: Nel and Kistner (2009); Bignaut and Venter (2011); Dlomo, Jansen, Moses and Yu (2011); Zewotir, North and Murray (2011); Essack, Wedekind and Naidoo (2012); Rankin, Schöer, Sebastiao and Van Walbeek (2012).

Some articles from the late twentieth-century address selection at schools of architecture in the United States of America. Moore (1970) critiqued the prevailing means of assessment for admission and suggested they be augmented with alternative tests that may reveal creative problem solving abilities. Nelson (1974) investigated the sociological reasons why students choose to study architecture and highlighted the fact that the majority of beginner students are total neophytes to architecture, while Domer (1981) analysed a battery of assessment tests and indicators for the admission of architecture students at the University of Kansas.

Peripheral references to selection at schools of architecture in South Africa are found in contemporary texts on the transformation of the architectural education sector, such as articles by Carter (2004:7-8) and Le Grange (2014:43-44), both specifically arguing points pertinent to the demographic distribution of the student intake at the school of architecture of the University of Cape Town (**UCT**). Selection at this school in 2001 is described and analysed in the paper 'Selection in a time of change' by Murray (2001); it provides insight to the challenges faced by many local schools of architecture.

Casakin and Gigi (2016) explored the relationship between visual and verbal cognitive styles and the performance of candidates in selection for admission to the school of architecture at the Ariel University in Israel. Adewale and Adhuze (2014) investigated the relationship between subject-specific admission requirements from and the academic performance of architecture students at certain tertiary institutions in Nigeria. They found that a student's performance in physics and mathematics made no significant contribution to their later performance at a school of architecture. Similar enquiries dealing with specifics of locale can be found in articles by Cubukcu and Cubukcu (2009), who studied possible correlations between the results of a centralised university entrance exam and the results of students in architecture in Turkey, and Olweny (2008), who questioned admission criteria for studies in architecture in Uganda. The recent thesis by Olweny (2015) appraised socialisation in architectural education in East Africa – Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda; it reveals perceptions and expectations of architectural education (from both students and members of faculty) and includes pertinent arguments about selection and the clarification of intake criteria.

Some pertinent research exists that addresses issues like normative positions, approaches, procedures and reflections on the outcomes of selection. The work of Abercrombie, Hunt and Stringer (1969, 1972) presents a comprehensive study of selection for admission to the Bartlett School of Architecture at University College London (**UCL**) for the period between 1960 and 1968. In *Selection and academic performance of students in a university school of architecture* (Abercrombie et al 1969) they account for the investigations of a research unit that was responsible for developing and implementing selection criteria through different procedures and formats, and studying the outcomes with statistical analyses overlaid with various informants on successful (and even some unsuccessful) applicants. This study is an exemplary model for both the depth and breadth of its research and its concern for the specificity of the school with which it was engaged. It is clear that the unit advised on more than selection as they actively supported teaching and learning, and assisted in formulating the Bartlett's approach to both at the time.

Goldschmidt, Sebba, Oren and Cohen (2001:281-289) investigated the means employed by 69 schools of architecture in 21 countries to assess applicants for admission through selection. Their analysis usefully extracted eight main assessment tools and indicated that congruent trends exist among the respondents to their survey, albeit that those respondents often offered disparate motives for the same action or disparate actions motivated by the same approach. Subsequently, their work was presented with a focus on a single school of architecture – Israel's Technion – in Oren, Cohen, Goldschmidt and Sebba (2005). The assessment tools defined by Goldschmidt et al (2001) informed components of, and some procedures for, this thesis. It also served as the basis for an enquiry on selection tools by Salama (2005:5), who extended the initial survey to a total of 118 institutions with similar quantitative findings as Goldschmidt et al (2001).

Two recent research studies are of interest as they investigate selection within the framework of architectural education in very specific contexts. The thesis by Izadi (2002) concentrates on the context of Iran with the purpose of evaluating and improving the methods of student selection in Iranian schools of architecture in the context of changed legislation and government requirements. Roberts (2004) locates his research at the Welsh School of Architecture at Cardiff University; his thesis investigates the (possible) relationship between cognitive style and a student's performance in architectural design education.

In the South African context an abridged reference was found in University of Natal (1973: 22-25). The document is a transcript of an architectural teachers' seminar held in Durban, South Africa, during July 1973. It summarises a paper presented by Harber and Kearney and the ensuing discussion. This source indicates that there was interest in selection and that research had been conducted on the matter at some South African schools of architecture. Le Grange (1989:36-38) highlighted challenges in the recruitment and admission of black students in South Africa with reference to the school of architecture at UCT. Most recently the research of Janse van Rensburg (2011, 2015, 2016) has highlighted the role of the design studio (and the pedagogic approach of those who lead studios) in her discourse on transformation. While her thesis (2015:450-461) documents the selection process at the University of the Witwatersrand (**Wits**), it deals in depth with the development of her normative approach to teaching architecture to beginner students after selection is concluded.

For the purpose of this study, the most significant local sources on the selection of students for studies in architecture relate to selection practices at UP. The first of these is a thesis in psychology (Herholdt 1972) that presents a programme for the selection of architecture students at UP. This thesis was developed with the Department of Architecture at UP and served as the basis for its selection practices from 1971 until the mid 1990s. These practices were assessed in Kemp's report on selection between 1971 and 1990 (Kemp 1991) and other references from the period documented in the archives of the Department of Architecture at UP.

1.2.3. Research opportunity

From the overview of existing literature it is clear that there is very little pertinent literature available, especially of a contemporary nature and emanating from South Africa, on the selection of students for admission to programmes in architecture. There are many possible reasons why this is so; one might speculate that institutions may view information on selection as proprietary, or it could be that selection is separated from the academic agenda and, as such, resorts under administrative functions performed by non-academic staff. It could also indicate a lack of research or interest (or both), or indeed that no need exists for such research. Indications are that the latter is unlikely as the practice is prevalent in most schools of architecture worldwide and the published body of knowledge therefore contradicts the reality that selection for admission is a ubiquitous practice.

Thus, the impetus for this study, against this background of scarcity, the availability of unpublished archival sources and the experience accumulated over the past decade with structuring and implementing a procedure for selection provide an opportunity for conducting this research.

1.2.4. Problem statement

1.2.4.1. Main problem statement

The main problem is to critically assess the methods employed for the selection of beginner students in architecture at UP between 1971 and 2016 in order to reflect and make recommendations as to current procedures.

1.2.4.2. Supposition to the main problem

The supposition to the main problem is that a generalist approach to selection is inadequate for the appropriate assessment of applications for the admission of beginner students in architecture at UP and therefore that a specific approach is required that is informed by the modes and means of learning and teaching in the programme for which students are selected.

1.2.4.3. Subproblem 1

In order to understand the context of the main problem we need to critically investigate the admission procedures and assessment tools for selection into systems of architectural education worldwide.

1.2.4.4. Supposition to subproblem 1

The supposition to subproblem one is that schools of architecture worldwide use a variety of differing admission procedures and apply multiple assessment tools during selection.

1.2.4.5. Subproblem 2

In order to understand the context of the main problem we need to determine and critically investigate the admission procedures and assessment tools for the selection of beginner students into schools of

architecture in South Africa.

1.2.4.6. Supposition to subproblem 2

The supposition to subproblem two is that schools of architecture in South Africa use admission procedures and assessment tools for the selection of beginner students that are similar to those used by schools of architecture worldwide.

1.2.4.7. Subproblem 3

In order to understand the context of the main problem we need to critically examine the trajectory of historical selection practices for the admission of beginner students in architecture at the University of Pretoria from 1971 until 2006.

1.2.4.8. Suppositions to subproblem 3

The first supposition to subproblem three is that the trajectory of historical selection practices for the admission of beginner students in architecture at the University of Pretoria between 1971 and 1994 were based on research findings and were compatible with and analogous to teaching and learning in the programme for which students were selected.

The second supposition to subproblem three is that the trajectory of historical selection practices for the admission of beginner students in architecture at the University of Pretoria between 1995 and 2006 was informed by managerial policies and were general and not specifically aligned with teaching and learning in the programme for which students were selected.

1.2.4.9. Subproblem 4

In order to understand the context of the main problem we need to critically examine the trajectory of selection practices for the admission of beginner students in architecture at the University of Pretoria from 2007 until 2016.

1.2.4.10. Supposition to subproblem 4

The supposition to subproblem four is that the selection practices for the admission of beginner students in architecture at the University of Pretoria between 2007 and 2016 were specific to, and had a positive interrelationship with, teaching and learning in the programme for which students were selected.

1.3. DELIMITATIONS

The concern of this study is the standard educational trajectory for architectural education in South Africa, namely a full-time, studio-based education with an undergraduate degree at level 7 of the National Qualifications Framework (NQF), followed by two postgraduate degrees at NQF levels 8 and 9 respectively.

The study deals with the selection for admission of beginner students in architecture, namely those first year students at undergraduate or first-degree level who have not previously undertaken studies in architecture at a higher education institution. It therefore includes school leavers, but also those who may have studied towards other degree or diploma courses in other disciplines and who may, or may not, have completed such studies.

The context of this research after the first year of study is the first qualification that a beginner student could or can obtain at UP. As the case study covers a period of forty-five years, during which the structure and duration of the programme changed, the study is concerned with the five and six-year Bachelor of Architecture degree until it was replaced with the three-year Bachelor of Science in Architecture in 1999. The admission of advanced students, including those undertaking professional postgraduate studies and those applicants undergoing Recognition of Prior Learning (**RPL**) procedures, are excluded from this study.

1.4. ASSUMPTIONS

It is assumed that this study is undertaken within a framework of academic normalcy and academic and organic and evolutionary change and that therefore that any findings and results will impact positively and progressively in a related future academic trajectory.

1.5. METHODOLOGIES

Mixed methodologies were employed in the undertaking of the research. Sources were engaged through a literature study in order to build a frame of reference so as to be able to situate the study and subsequently to critically distil aspects pertinent to the research. In order to contextualise this information on the local front a survey of selection practices at schools of architecture in South Africa was undertaken by means of a questionnaire compliant with the demands of research ethics.

The initial desktop study of literature was subsequently expanded to the sourcing, collating and systematising of primary material for their accessioning to the Department's repository for future research. This was done in an effort to access information pertinent to the major case study and to assist in delineating and developing an understanding for particular episodes in the trajectory of historical selection practices there. It was also necessary to document aspects of recent selection practices in order to make them available to reviewers and to allow for the critical assessment of, and reflection on, ongoing procedures.

1.6. EXPECTED OUTCOMES

The principal expected outcome is to be able to situate the selection practices for the admission of beginner students in architecture at UP over the course of forty-five years within the international and the local frameworks of practice so as to be able to identify strongpoints and shortcomings that could confirm or refute the validity of the selection practices, the approaches that inform them and the procedures through which they are implemented. It is expected that a critical assessment and reflection will serve to improve and support future endeavours in selection.

1.7. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Admission refers to the act of obtaining and gaining entry to an academic institution, for the purpose of this study to a higher learning institution and specifically to a school of architecture. Admission is a generic term and does not imply that a prospective student will gain entry by means of selection.

Academic year refers to the South African academic calendar year. At the UP the academic year starts in February and ends early in December. Academic years therefore correspond with calendar years. The academic year in South Africa is divided into two semesters, with short recesses in April, July and September. Current practice requires that selection for a particular academic year take place in the preceding year. Unless otherwise stated, this study refers to cohorts according to the calendar year in which their studies officially commenced.

Admission criteria – see Admission requirements

Assessment instruments refer to the means that guide assessors in a specific evaluation task. In the context of this thesis assessment instruments are employed to direct the evaluation of assessment tools during selection.

Admission policy refers to the official procedure and protocol published by an academic institution in order to outline their admission requirements and admission procedure. An admission policy is generally approved by management or other structures of an institution and thus become sanctioned through regulation.

Admission procedure refers to the measures used by academic institutions to effect the admission of a student. This may include selection.

Admission requirements refer to the requirements published by higher education institutions as prerequisites for admission to a specific academic programme. It usually entails minimum achievement ratings or percentages for specific school subjects and an average expression of the applicant's academic achievement, such as the Matriculation Score or an Admission Point Score (APS). Typically meeting the minimum admission requirements does not guarantee admission if the institution selects applicants for admission to academic programmes with a limited intake.

Assessment tools generally refer to the instruments used to evaluate or measure the progress, development or academic readiness of a learner, student or applicant in an academic environment. In the context of this study, assessment tools refer specifically to the instruments that schools of architecture employ to evaluate applications for admission through selection.

Beginner student refers to a student who commences higher education in a specific field of study. In the context of this thesis a beginner student of architecture is a first year student at undergraduate level who has not previously undertaken studies in architecture at higher education level.

Criterion (or **criteria** in the plural form) refers to a standard or principle by which an aspect may be judged or decided or that serves as a reason for making a judgment or decision.

Ecosystemic thinking is an approach that was borrowed from the discipline of psychology. According to Fisher and Clarke (2011:20): “To think ecosystemically is to think of systems as nested, each as part of a larger system; made up of sub-systems and in turn as a part of a supra-system. These sub-systems can develop properties that are emergent and are thus uniquely properties of the supra-system and not found in the sub-systems. We can thus speak of the ecology of building materials as biologists would use the term, and understand the term and see each element as part of a larger whole which impacts on other sub- and supra-systems.”

Matric (shortened from **matriculation**) refers to the highest year of secondary schooling in the South African educational system, namely Grade 12 (of twelve years of combined primary and secondary schooling) through which a learner can obtain the National Senior Certificate; from this term follows **matriculant** (a learner completing the final year of schooling) and **matriculate** (completing Grade 12 successfully with a pass grade).

School of architecture refers to a department, unit or other managerial entity at higher education institutions that formally presents validated professional programmes in architecture according to the following definition of the Collins English Dictionary (2007:1444): “a faculty, institution, or department specializing in a particular subject”. Confusingly, the organisational structure of higher education institutions in South Africa refers to academic programmes that are presented by departments that are organised in schools or colleges that are, in turn, grouped together in faculties. As an example, the Department of Architecture at UP presents professional programmes in architecture, among other disciplines, validated by the local statutory body and is therefore, in the context of this study, a school of architecture. Organisationally, the Department of Architecture forms part of the School for the Built Environment, which in turn resorts under the Faculty of Engineering, Built Environment and Information Technology at UP.

Selection refers to the processes and procedures employed by higher learning institutions to scrutinise and assess aspects of a prospective student’s academic credentials or other abilities through predefined criteria, or by employing a range of possible assessment tools, or a combination thereof, prior to granting admission to an academic programme.

1.8. ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AERU - Architectural Education Research Unit (at the Bartlett School of Architecture)

AA - Architectural Association

APS - Admission Point Score

ARB - Architects Registration Board

ASAT - Architecture School Aptitude Test

CAA - Commonwealth Association of Architects

CPD - Continuing Professional Development

CPUT - Cape Peninsula University of Technology

CSIR - Council for Scientific and Industrial Research

DUT - Durban University of Technology

GPA - Grade Point Average

ICOMOS - International Council on Monuments and Sites

ISAA - Institute of South African Architects

MIT - Massachusetts Institute of Technology

NATA - National Aptitude Test in Architecture

NBRI - National Building Research Institute, a division of the CSIR

NBT - National Benchmark Tests

NCARB - National Council of Architectural Registration Boards

NQF - National Qualifications Framework

NMMU - Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University

NSC - National Senior Certificate

OBE - Outcomes Based Educational

RPL - Recognition of Prior Learning

RIBA - Royal Institute of British Architects

SACAP - South African Council for the Architectural Profession

SAIA - South African Institute of Architects

SANS - South African National Standards

SAQA - South African Qualifications Authority

TUC / TUK - Transvaal University College / *Transvaalse Universiteitskollege* in Afrikaans; antecedent of UP and therefore the origin of the acronym **Tuks** that is generally used to refer to UP

TUT - Tshwane University of Technology

UCL - University College London

UCT - University of Cape Town

UFS - University of the Free State

UIA - International Union of Architects

UJ - University of Johannesburg

UKZN - University of KwaZulu-Natal

UP - University of Pretoria

Wits - University of the Witwatersrand