

# Shaping the Academic Assessment and the Quality Assurance in the European Higher Architectural Education Area

## Discussion

Coordination by

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

**Matteo Robiglio**, Thessaloniki, Greece

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

Thank-you very much for being on time. Before starting the discussion, our esteemed colleague from Finland, Juhani Katainen, asked me if he could have five minutes just to add some important information related to ACE, regarding the problems of quality and accreditation.

**Juhani Katainen**, Tampere, Finland

I would like to comment on what our chairman said; that ACE may take on some issues which we are discussing here. I don't think this is so as ACE is just as concerned as we are here. I have been ACE Vice President this year, and the past president. We will be having our next board meeting in a few weeks and I will be revealing to them all of the positive things that have been going on at this conference. The reason I am speaking about this is that I have to give information about the negotiations between ACE, on behalf of the European Union, and different countries in the world. An agreement is being negotiated between the EU and Mexico so that Mexican architects can be accepted in Europe and our architects in Mexico. We have also been dealing for two years with the American Architects Associations, AIA and ENCORP on a similar MRA agreement and it is going well. The Americans are using their system, as Marvin wonderfully explained, to approve of their architects' quality. We are confident that all schools included in the architects' directive lists are doing the same fine work, and as insiders it is important that we do it properly. We should discuss today these issues referred to in these pages in order to make the work really feasible. We now have our American colleagues' trust but we have to continue to work for that trust. We really rely on the Architects Directive, article 3 and there is a list of the schools, so we are honoured but we have to work for that honour.

The last thing for further discussion is the question: "To whom do we have to prove that we are good?" I will give you one answer to that, but there are many others, which is our students, management or money givers and so forth. An important issue when we are creating the systems is, how we do these things and also one has to answer, whom we are working for.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

Thank-you very much Juhani for this addition. I think it is very important for us to understand that we are not two different parties or contrary to each other, but that in fact we can be three in this case. To start the discussion, we have prepared together with Matteo and the working group a couple of questions for which points can be raised. We thought it was important that we show again what we discussed and decided in the 2001 meeting, the so called Hania statement, and since it should not always be in English, we took the French version. We stated in Hania that the EAAE wanted to participate in the development of a system of control and assurance of quality, which would be specific to the needs and particularities of architectural education with respect for the diversity of educational research throughout the schools in Europe. I think that is important as a starting point because if we don't take a firm position then quality risks being assessed regardless of the specifics of architectural design education. It is a very important point and this issue was raised during this conference, as well as at the previous one by several participants. As we have already experienced and seen in the results of the questionnaires, some universities already apply the systems of assessment or are using criteria that are not properly adapted to architectural education. Therefore, the first question we could discuss is: Should EAAE as an organization under take positive actions, maybe at a "political" level, to ensure that these specifics are taken into account and should we take action? The second question to discuss is: As an organization, should we try to establish general guidelines and criteria standards for assessment and quality assurance specific to the architectural field? The third question: Should EAAE, according to Marvin's American example, establish a list of qualified peers, experts or whatever you want to call them? Maybe the first and most important thing for discussion is the guidelines and criteria standards. That is it so far and, now it's up to you from the floor. Who wants to start?

**Aart Oxenaar**, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

We have just had our accreditation visit. I don't know how many schools have already had them, but we now have some experience. The Dutch system is very much on the move. The points for discussion are very good, important and necessary but maybe we should add one question, and ask ourselves how to react to situations. When the Governments are doing things, how should we react? We can ask ourselves as EAAE why not become proactive and become an accrediting body? In the Netherlands accreditation has now been privatised. The state has a meta evaluation. They evaluate the accrediting organizations, but anyone can start their own accreditation organization. As EAAE, as a group of schools or as professional bodies, we could also do that. You can organize your own accrediting committees and in that way you take it on hand. I think that could also be a point for discussion. I have heard from talking to other people, that if the peer reviewing system and visiting committees remain national and local, quite

soon you will end up visiting and accrediting each other. I think it is very important to internationalise peer reviews and visiting committees and, in fact, I moved for that when we had our first accreditation and the Dutch authorities didn't want to pay for translating so it had to be a Dutch speaking committee. Luckily we could bring in a Dutch speaking Belgian and a person of Dutch origin from England who had been teaching there for a long time. I think it is very important to have internationalised committees and this is a suggestion for discussion.

**Matteo Robiglio**, Torino, Italy

Maybe we can react to this at once because the working group has been considering that EAAE become an evaluation or an assessment body. I don't think we should debate this at the moment as the group conceded it is a distant, master scenario. The first steps to be taken are political where universities are evaluated with criteria specific to architecture. In time it might eventually come, and though, it might be an output of the work, such solid work that we become so reputable to be seen from the outside as an accreditation body. However, it is the feeling of the working commission on this theme that it is not an immediate objective of the EAAE. At this moment the subject hasn't ripened and we feel we are not ready for such a big step.

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

Just another question concerning information, because to be sincere, we have lost last year's list of who in the room has already been subjected to evaluation. Therefore, we would like to have this list. I'm asking if we can circulate the list and collect it.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

I think Matteo made the correct point that we should first do our own homework and that we may start with setting our own guidelines before we really move into action.

**Dimitri Kotsakis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

There are four points I would like to make. The first one is that we cannot go on discussing assessment further unless we put it with the discussion about curriculum. Assessment is a feedback process because the schools make the programs, they are assessed, then they go back to remaking the programs. The two discussions have to be put together before we make any conclusion and go on, besides, it is not possible to have any final conclusion with this discussion only. That is the first point.

The second point which I've raised before deals with the key issue in the mission of the assessment. In Marvin's explanation of the American system a contradiction emerged and I am not sure if we realized it. I want to point out that it was between two objectives or two mission statements. The one is that the assessor is a councillor or helper and based on your mission statement and your objectives, we are councillors or our job is counselling. This is an emerging definition of assessment. Another necessary definition of assessment from the past is the 'control of the authorities'. From this definition of assessment comes like in the American system, for example, other things

such as the process of objecting to a member of the team as it is like in the court of justice where we object to a member of the jury. This is from the definition of the authority applied to the school. Within this same definition of 'authority' assessment is the secret report from the assessing team given to the body. These two definitions of assessment, the one that is counselling, and the other imposing a kind of authority, whether we call it state or market authority or of society, these definitions are different, so, when we go into the discussion it is a delicate question. Of course, we prefer the first definition, the counselling one, but the second one exists. Let us be very precise on this, it does exist.

The third point, the first order and second order is the assessment of the schools and the assessment of the assessors or assessment bodies.

This point has caused many complications because again we have the feedback procedure so the assessed has to assess the assessors. Only in this case the second order assessment has any meaning. It does not create a super authority on top of the authority.

Now we come to the forth question, what is EAAE going to do with this. My position is that unless we answer all the previous questions we cannot go further.

**Marvin Malecha**, North Carolina, United States

Just a very quick response, the only thing that can be held in confidence between the team and the National Architectural Accrediting Board itself is the term of accreditation. Everything else must be in the public report. So the visiting team can say we recommend a six-year term or we recommend a three-year term, that's all it can say in confidence. The reason for this is the final decision is the board's decision. Everything else is public and the school has the right to respond to the visiting teams report prior to the boards reading of the report. It is very important to understand that and I just wanted to make that clear, otherwise I agree with you, there is ultimately some element of regulation that the school chooses to enter into in order to be recognized so their students can be qualified to sit for licensure. There is that aspect of it, yes.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

Thank-you Marvin for this clarification. Thank-you also Dimitri for your comment, I think it is quite valuable and we should take it into account, but I would actually prefer if we could really go a bit deeper into the guideline criteria standards. This is a very important point and it is really related to the content of what we are aiming at. But of course within the context you were pointing out there was.... Yes comment?

**Gunnar Parelius**, Trondheim, Norway

I would like to comment on the question: "should the EAAE develop the common guidelines?" What I have seen from these discussions, in that we do agree upon the words sometimes, but we do not agree upon the reality behind the words. There are so many different types of schools in Europe and if we agree too early upon the words, it would be a counter productive situation. We need to have the knowledge of the

difference between the types of schools and the criteria set within each school, and their own way of doing it or else these guidelines would be some kind of lip service to words only.

The other point and, I am not quite sure if this is obvious, but when you have accreditation you have to ask what is good enough and if it is of good quality. It is one kind of discussion a really good school, but it is quite a different kind of discussion whether we should really use all these assessments to develop the school's rating, not to be just like the government and just say this is a good enough school. You can get a levelling down of the quality all over and that is a dangerous development if you are not focusing on it.

**Matteo Robiglio**, Torino, Italy

I just wanted to make a comment and let's keep to Herman's definition. We are not talking about accreditation, because in any state there is an accreditation system and until we have a European accreditation system it is useless to discuss this. We are talking about assessment and what it means that we will never say that your school is better than the other school or that there is a European scale of schools that nobody else wants. The idea is to help each school to say, "I am here and I would like to go there - how can I measure this?"

The second problem that we have all considered; is, imagine you are in a polytechnic school discussing with your colleagues of Mathematics and Physics how you evaluate a full professor in architecture. There are two possible outputs of this discussion. He is either measured by the parameters of the other scientific communities or our scientific community produces solid proof to the others that we can evaluate ourselves; otherwise, they will do it for you because in our Polytechnic school that is the risk. When my department refused to submit themselves to quantification, points were taken off, and in my opinion this was right. You can despise quantification but if you don't elaborate on your own self assessed standards then someone else will impose their meter and say you are too small, that is what they usually say. Please be clear, we don't want to go either for accreditation or for classifying and ranking of schools, this is not the problem.

**Dimitri Kotsakis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

As a response to that; the words here say criteria and standards and that's some kind of levelling and common ground.

**Matteo Robiglio**, Torino, Italy

I just want to give an example of standards. Let's say what is relevant when you judge the impact of a design scheme upon debate. How do you do that? I would like to invite everybody, as if we were trying to do some kind of brain storming, to say I would propose this kind of criteria or to say in my country we use this kind of standard. By putting together these ideas we get a portrait of what these guidelines could be and whether the working commission can go on working on these themes. I would suggest we discuss not if but how this could be done.

**Gunnar Parelius**, Trondheim, Norway

I'm not quite sure you got my point, so if it wasn't clear, I apologize. You need the process to make the schools good; that's an important thing and that the criteria and standards being discussed are very useful, but are not set on the European level of thinking, which would help make every different kind of school good in this process. The important thing is the process in which to make the schools efficient.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

I think Matteo put an important point forward; how do you measure what are within the schools themselves? Do you use the same criteria as one does in Maths or Physics? Or does an architectural school have its' own? How to appoint a professor is another matter? I think this is important and it is what I have heard over these three days and previously.

**Patrick Labarque**, Gent, Belgium

I think what you said now, how you measure it, is the important thing. It's important that we communicate how we do it among the different schools, which I think is a role that the EAAE can play. The question about "what", I think we have to let the universities decide. It's a question with lots of elements as I read in the text and they talk about identity and about diversity. I think it is still in a defensive way and has to put in a more positive way. If you say that diversity has quality and that this diversity is interesting, you may not define it on a European level. What is important is how we measure it and that we communicate to each other how we do it so that we learn from this process. I think to learn about how we do it is very important and it's a question of communication.

**Theano Fotiou**, Athens, Greece

I do agree with the two colleagues and their remarks because I think we are in a very unstable situation now and a very transient and continually changing landscape in Europe in the field of architectural education. It's not the time to establish criteria that are so general and that have no meaning. What we need is first to understand what everybody is doing around Europe and to understand our diversity and the special qualities each of us have. Let's face reality; the assessment process normally brings difficulties and conflicts. So we are not at the level to start with these conflicts or to generalize in such a way that we drop the standards of quality. We are an organization that has to establish very strong relationships and understanding through collaboration so that we can really understand what we are producing and, then, perhaps we will be able to make real generalizations from words. That's my point.

**Pierre von Meiss**, Lausanne, Switzerland

Listening to what is being said, there may be some misunderstanding. Perhaps we could take away the word 'standards'. It has nothing to do with standards of teaching but standards of evaluation. I think that is what you mean, if I am right.

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

I feel some defensive attitude towards what has been said but I would like to emphasize at least one advantage in my experience. When somebody from outside of the school is looking at the school, he can show you the picture that you can never see yourself. It's the same thing when we have students from abroad. Even if we don't teach them anything, the first thing that they gain is to look at their situation from the outside. This is one of the strong points of this procedure of assessment. If you have others looking at your situation, not to blame you, but in the counselling process, it is very valuable as it is very difficult to perceive yourself from where you are on your own. This is the reason why I think that the rich experience of Marvin having been in many places is a very valuable position.

**Gunnar Pærlus**, Trondheim, Norway

My point is that it is a very valuable situation the fact that we are many different schools and that we need to open up dialogue between the schools that are keeping up what is beneficial, and keeping it alive. Then you don't have to have this outside criteria decided upon by any one party, about what is good, before you have this dialogue. It is important to open up the dialogue and not to have a third party decided upon by one party.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

I think, as Pierre said, we may have some trouble understanding each other and maybe it is a case of communication difficulties. I think what Herman was saying now is very wise. It's the fact you get a mirror of yourself by peer review and you see yourself more clearly. It's very well known that you are too close to the situation to see it. I don't think it should be a role of the EAAE to set standards. Standards is not a good word and thank you, Pierre, for mentioning that, but maybe EAAE could help to describe elements. I am very cautious about what I am saying now, but elements could be used in each peer review, which we consider is of general importance, taking into account the diversity of the schools and their systems.

**Pierre von Meiss**, Lausanne, Switzerland

In fact there already exists quite reasonably thought through systems. One of them you might not know of because you don't read German, but the Germans have these guidelines that have been adapted for architecture in several versions, as Germany is not one country in terms of education as you know. I have been on an evaluation for a school in Germany and they are not bad systems and if we collect the information on the ones that do exist I think it wouldn't take too long to develop these guidelines. I think we should do it because it is a pity that there is a British and German one, (not just one German, but many German ones). I have been working on one which a pedagogical institute in Austria has done because it didn't fit architecture, which is terrible, and we should avoid this.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

Indeed you are right and I learnt from the statistics, although they were sort of moving

fast on the screen, that about one third of the schools already apply a self-assessment procedure, so these schools should have their information on this as well. Maybe it would be a good idea to collect these and compare them to see what comes out of it.

**Dimitri Kotsakis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

I think that this particular group must be very clear on one issue.. We cannot make final statements on recommendations or anything at all concerning assessment. In the group on curriculum we said in principle that we are not going to say anything or write anything that looks like we are issuing rules or directives towards what the best curriculum is. We must be very precise on that; we decided we are only working on awareness and knowledge and on defining the state of the art. Nothing is to be written or spoken which insinuates that we are trying to issue rules.

I must stress this because and I will say why. We are rushing into power with the pretext of counselling that is very dangerous; we are rushing into it on a level that the ground is slippery. This Association is a free association and if we are not careful we will not make it stronger or greater but we will destroy it. I will stress this point for the third time and, if necessary, 103 times.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

Dimitri I don't think you should be afraid. I don't think it is an issue...

**Dimitri Kotsakis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

I am not afraid, I know. Fear and knowledge or experience are two different things. I don't have the slightest fear..... I don't have the slightest fear, I have knowledge.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

No, but I don't think it is a question about imposing rules, but guidelines are something else. They are something you set up to help people and to help schools on how they can help themselves to improve their own quality. I think that is what we are talking about and not about imposing rules or legislation, that's not the case.

**Dimitri Kotsakis**, Thessaloniki, Greece

I come from the east which knows very well how to use this trick; to say one thing and do the other.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

That's too heavy.

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

I fully support my suggestions because I think we have to collect existing systems, then,

present them and hopefully we can learn from them. In no way are we going to impose anything; that is not our ambition. Another issue and maybe one difference that has to be brought to the floor with regards to what was presented from the States is that we face the problem of different languages. In the States you can go and assess the schools and read everything but here it is different. It's not a matter of the self-assessment report but you have to read all of the documents of the projects and all of the interviews of the people, and language is a problem. But this is not the story and maybe it's a wrong term for the guidelines. That's the reason why I presented the one list and didn't say this is the only list. I say this is the list that they use in Belgium and it is a secondary revised list after more than fifty of these visits. We have to look at this and say this seems interesting or this is not interesting for us and for each school, and not for us as a whole. I also reject the idea of EAAE as being the assessing board. Sorry, but in my opinion that is the aim of this organization.

**Per Olaf Fjeld, Oslo, Norway**

Whether we like it or not I think as a group we should have the capacity to understand Dimitri's comments because whatever guidelines we make, however general they might be, maybe there is still a beneficial way of making these guidelines. We should try to do that, but at the same time we should take into consideration what Dimitri was talking about within the awareness of not putting this into a set of rules. We should not be so strong on one opinion related to this that one couldn't really listen to oppositions like what was said by Dimitri.

**Matteo Robiglio, Torino, Italy**

I have the impression that the debate is on the principle of taking the word guidelines as if it were guidelines for the schools to do this or do that. We were talking about the possible elaboration of guidelines and criteria for evaluating architectural design education, research and teaching, which is something completely different. It is not a guideline that you should accomplish as an institution, but a guideline to help us understand how we can establish sound criteria adapted to architectural teaching and to its diversity. I have the impression that the guidelines that belong to polytechnic schools or technical universities where there are many other disciplines know this problem very well through their own experiences. I will give you an example, a story that might help break the ice. I was talking with the director of PhD programmes in my school and he asked me how we decide what is scientifically relevant in our sector. He knows fairly well what is relevant and what is not in his field (physics an complexity), just by checking two or three main international journals. He happens to be a friend of Zaha Hadid, and once asked her how she would judge relevant work in her (ours) field - architecture - if she were to select a new teacher for her school. She answered: by checking the results of the latest international competitions. This is a clear criteria and that's what we are looking for. For instance we should debate, which is a major concern according to the statistics that Katia was working on, the scientific relevance of professional work. That is an enormous issue because we risk having schools that have a certain set of criteria, and a professional body on the outside that considers what is relevant that is completely different. That schizophrenia is really dangerous. I would really like to put forward criteria on how we judge what is reviewed.

Another problem is that our architectural reviews are not indexed in an easy way. Maybe we should try to develop an indexing system in architecture so when I publish something and you quote it in your work, it makes the work relevant for both of us. This idea could be completely useless, but these are the kinds of things we were looking for in clues on how to build something that mirrors or that gives the image of others, as was said before, and not to make it a deforming mirror, because if I look at myself in the mathematician's mirror I am either too thin or too small. We should try to be more concrete and less ideological about evaluation and to set standards, and not to have a single measure. There is no single measure, but there will be, in my opinion, if we don't do this work, and it will be stated by somebody else. Another precious contribution would be to say what we judge as being relevant when we judge architectural teaching and architectural work.

**Per Olaf Fjeld**, Oslo, Norway

But if it is as simple as you suggest, maybe each school has the capacity to do it on their own. There is another type of knowledge within this discussion that is more important.

**Pierre von Meiss**, Lausanne, Switzerland

Well today it is not like that. The schools don't have the freedom to develop their own structure and assessment criteria. They receive either from a government agency or some kind of authority the way the assessment and their self-report should be structured. The very difficult thing and I really don't see a solution so far to the problem, is when it comes to design because if one school looks at design with a certain philosophy and the other with a different one you cannot start to compare them, except to say that they are different. It is very difficult to make a guideline on how to assess the design quality of the school. I don't really see how to do it, because there is ideology behind it and how can you make a guideline to evaluate ideology?

**Gunnar Parelius**, Trondheim, Norway

Well I don't think the disagreement is that extensive. The disagreement is about whether you want one document of guidelines from this organization or does this organization start developing communication between schools on how to do it, to get other schools in to do it and to get the kind of discussion that is public. There is the question of architectural criteria and guidelines as opposed to the way other disciplines do it. It's a very relevant one and how do we address it; by multiple voices or just one voice with just one kind of criteria. That is the whole disagreement here.

**Richard Foqué**, Antwerp, Belgium

I think you are right, it is not so much a disagreement here but in addition to Pierre Von Meiss's intervention, the problem is situated on the level of design and how do you look at that and compare it.. I don't want to confuse the discussion but from my very limited experience on that level, I know for instance it is difficult to get European money for typical architectural research programs. I don't know why this is but I guess it may have to do

with exactly what Matteo was saying, that maybe they are using criteria not applicable to the architectural research status that we use ourselves. It's also, in my opinion, a question of money and also getting to know these directives as well. So I think it's a lot more complicated than we think and there are a lot of consequences as well.

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

For your information I haven't done that in my school. I am not sure, but in one of the assessment sessions, colleagues of ours made a proposal to evaluate the quality of the teaching of design, not as I said, judging on the result. I will read and translate it in English and you can either forget about it or listen if you like. Does the tutor highlight the relevance of the assignment within the broader context of architecture? Then there are the statistics of all of these questions. Are the specific goals of the design assignment clearly described? Is the assignment well defined with side briefs, notes and are the laws that are deliverable well defined? What are the criteria of evaluation and are they set clearly right from the beginning? Can the assignments be done within the limits of the time scheduled? Are they in between deadlines feasible? Is working in the design studio stimulating? Can the research for design be done within the allocated time? Does the time spent on design assignments and the surplus of allocated time hamper my commitment to product subject, etc.? Are appointments with the tutor appropriate? Does the evaluation fit the criteria? Are the intermediate evaluations frequent enough? Is the final evaluation and jury fair? Were the tutor's comments suitable? Am I properly prepared to make the design? Does this assignment allow me to improve my technical competence? Does this assignment allow me to improve my designer skills? Does this assignment widen my scope on architecture? Is there enough material and documentation available while designing? Has working in groups enriched my personality? Do the working groups function well? Was my input into the group work evaluated correctly? That is the context and I can read it, but if you like to know what kind of questions they use to evaluate how the tutoring is, it's a sample and you can say I don't like it, or I do.

**James Horan**, Dublin, Ireland

Thank-you Richard. I have just been listening very carefully to this very interesting area of discussion this morning and something has crossed my mind. To some extent we always have to find a way to go forward and to think about what we must do next, but I think we have to be careful about how we find that way forward. Let me give you an example that just occurred to me. Supposing we had a problem about painting the wall at the back of this building and we have invited six architects to tell us the colour that they want it painted and we get six colours put forward. How do we evaluate the guy who says it should be red against the guy who says it should be blue? I suspect that in schools of architecture we don't really know how we evaluate design. We instinctively tend to agree on what's a good project, what's a mediocre project and what's a poor project. We use devices like the end product, the process by which it is reached and various other techniques to assess and evaluate it. There exists a really interesting possibility to try and challenge schools. The EAAE should challenge its membership to tell us how you personally, in your school, evaluate design and if we were to collect, for example, that as a piece of information, i.e. a body of probably enormously conflicting

knowledge, but it is nevertheless knowledge and information and out of it we might all enrich the process in which we engage. It is only by taking these kinds of steps gradually and carefully, one at a time, that we can get to a point where we could begin to decide how we would assess the schools or develop guidelines and major criteria. We should start with areas that we know are uncertain, explore them and see what we can discover.

**Spyros Raftopoulos**, Athens, Greece

Well I think James Horan's remark is very valid but I would like to go back to Herman Neuckermans' list of criteria. Without trying to be funny, do the students reply before grading or after grading?

After grading, if the student is not satisfied he may reply in many different and definitely negative ways. It's a very delicate problem of how to evaluate the answers of students. We have come across that dilemma as we have a self-assessment system in our school in Athens and we find that the good students give very positive answers to some of these questions and some of the past students don't give any positive answers but usually respond negatively. So how do you evaluate these answers and how do you take these answers into consideration in the whole process of self-assessment or assessment by other people of the curriculum and the school?

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

I would say not automatically but with wisdom, if sixty percent of the answers say this tutor is not showing up then maybe the forty others are right. It's all statistics, and you can object to statistics but of course you have to read statistics in the proper way. It's a matter of information. I know when I read these results, which I didn't propose myself; they looked very controlling. It was just an input you can add on to the others.

**Selahattin Önür**, Ankara, Turkey

We are out of time but I feel that we have the chance of focusing on the role of the EAAE and what we want it to be. It is crucial and I think it is most appropriate for this group that is meeting here to discuss the next role of the EAAE, i.e. to emphasise something that was said in the beginning, that maybe EAAE can be functional in facilitating the International Organization of External Assessment by means of peer groups. Can we make a statement of this sort before going into criteria and guidelines because it seems that most of the reactions are based on the feeling that there is an intervention, which I tend to agree with. We need these of course but...

Another point is what we have been doing so far with these interview inquiries exploring what the schools are doing and finding their methods and experiences which I think came out from the questions. If EAAE can make a report of what the schools are doing I think that can be a positive way forward.

**Herman Neuckermans**, Leuven, Belgium

I am a little bit disappointed that something I said before is happening again. I have the

feeling that architecture is reluctant to build upon the knowledge of others but are willing to reinvent the work time and time again. Inform yourself and learn from others, then judge yourself and say: "this is not applicable but at least I informed myself".

